

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XI, No. 17
WHOLE No. 1010

February 2, 1929

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

	PAGES
CHRONICLE	393-396
EDITORIALS	
Waiting for Christ—Savage and Brutal Legislation—The Child-Labor Situation—Morals and "Big Business"—Public Service Commissions—Woman's Place	397-399
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
A Papal Slogan: Catholic Action—Charles Carroll, Patriot and Catholic—Graham Bread and Coffee—Opportunity for the Negro	400-407
SOCIOLOGY	
A Letter from Louisville	408-409
EDUCATION	
Are the Laity Catholics?	409-410
POETRY	
Repoussé	407
WITH SCRIP AND STAFF	410-411
LITERATURE	
Shakespeare "Dyed a Papist"	412-413
REVIEWS	413-415
COMMUNICATIONS	416

Chronicle

Home News.—On January 22, the Senate unexpectedly appropriated an additional \$24,000,000 for Prohibition enforcement. The vote adopting an amendment of Senator Harris, of Georgia, to the first deficiency bill was 50 to 27, 36 Democrats and 13 Republicans supporting the amendment. Following Secretary Mellon's refusal to obey the Anti-Saloon League when that organization "cracked the whip" over him, the dry forces prevailed in the Senate. This immediately aroused strong opposition in the House on the eve of meeting the Senate in conference. The Administration was also thought to be against the measure and every effort was being made to defeat it by the threat of a veto on the ground that the appropriation had not been recommended by the Budget Bureau. Secretary Mellon's objections to the appropriation were met by enlarging the purposes for which the money will be spent, in a phrase leaving it to the President's discretion.—With the Kellogg Peace Pact out of the way, the campaign to adopt the cruiser bill began. This bill calls for the construction of fifteen light cruisers within three years. The President was said to be opposed to the time limit. The radicals in the Senate were directing their attention to reducing the number of cruisers and for

this reason it was felt that the Senate would adopt at least ten cruisers as a program, but no money would be appropriated. It was felt that the measure was for the purpose of strengthening the President's hand in disarmament negotiations. A quiet filibuster against the bill disappeared, and on January 23, it was made the order of business.

On January 17, the President affixed his signature to the instrument of ratification of the Kellogg-Briand Pact outlawing war as an instrument of national policy. The

Secretary of State also signed the document. The event was signaled by unusual ceremony. The Cabinet and many Senators were present in the East room of the White House. The next event in the procedure will be ratification by the other signatory Governments, and the treaty will be deposited with the League of Nations.

On January 18, Sir Esme Howard, the British Ambassador to the United States, informally notified Owen D. Young and J. P. Morgan of their appointment to serve as members of the international committee of experts for the revision of German reparations. He received their acceptance and thereupon the commission in Paris cabled its formal invitation. In its international aspect the coming meeting presents two problems for the United States: the opposition of this country to making the Allied debts to us a criterion of German payments to the Allies, and the apparent determination of the State Department to oppose commercialization of German reparations. The attitude of the American bankers on this latter question was not cleared up.

Mr. Hoover arrived at Miami, Fla., on January 22, and was expected to remain there with the twofold task of choosing his Cabinet and of writing his inaugural speech. Very little was allowed to leak out about his choices, but it was taken for granted that Secretary Jardine would remain in the Department of Agriculture and Secretary Mellon in the Treasury. Wide-spread propaganda was made to have Dwight W. Morrow appointed Secretary of State, but on January 24, an apparently official statement was published from Miami to the effect that Mr. Morrow would remain as Ambassador to Mexico, "since his work there was not even half finished." Mr. Morrow visited Mr. Hoover immediately after that statement was given out, and then went on to New York. Meanwhile, Mr. Hoover continued his conferences with political leaders, but the very contradictory nature of the newspaper reports showed that he had not allowed himself to be committed in any direction.

Congressional
Activities

President-Elect
Hoover

Afghanistan.—The situation in regard to the upheavals in Afghanistan remained practically unchanged at the present writing. Bacha Sakao, the bandit leader who had himself proclaimed Amir under the name of Habibullah, consolidated his position in the capital, Kabul. His capture of the city was not attended by bloodshed or looting. There was little known about the new Amir, or about the strength of his following. Thus far, the Shinwar tribes, which had first organized the rebellion against King Amanullah, have not accepted the new ruler. These tribes were carrying on operations in the vicinity of Kabul. It was reported that King Amanullah had prepared for a counter-attack against Habibullah. After his sudden abdication, Amanullah escaped to the province of Kandahar, in southern Afghanistan, which was friendly to him. It was not revealed whether he intended to set up a separate kingdom in these parts or to recruit the tribes for a drive against Kabul. The elder brother, Inayatullah, who succeeded Amanullah as King and who was deposed three days later by Habibullah, escaped first to Peshawur, India, in a British airplane. From Peshawur, he went to rejoin Amanullah in Kandahar. Dispatches from Moscow insisted that British interests were responsible for the overthrow of the Amanullah regime. Russia, moreover, offered hospitality to the former King. Great Britain denied all responsibility for the uprisings.

Austria.—In a recent speech the Austrian Chancellor, Msgr. Seipel, dealt with the difficulties and problems which confronted the Austrian Government. The fact that all the parties in Parliament formed a majority against the opposition of the isolated Social Democrats did not improve the situation of the Government. A middle party was lacking which might stand between the majority and the Socialists. There were, the Chancellor said, three ways of acting under the present circumstances. The first was a coalition with the Socialists which would do away with the opposition. This, however, seemed out of the question, since the Socialists showed an absolutely anti-religious tendency. While it was true that some of the other parties which had joined the majority were anti-religious also, yet in their case it meant only slight disagreement in collaboration; whereas the Socialists never could be brought into harmony. The other possibility was to allow the anti-religious parties and the Socialists to join and govern and so form an opposition under the Chancellor's leadership. This, however, would create an anti-religious majority. It would also be contrary to the will of the Austrian people, who had sent the Christian Socialists as the strongest party into Parliament and meant them to govern. The Chancellor advised a continuance of government with the help of the majority. The Parliament was confronted with the task of constitutional reforms, which included the reform of tenant laws. A demand for a revision of the marriage law was carried by a vote of 80 to 76. The present law forbids divorce and the opposition against it has been in progress since the establishment of the Republic.

Czechoslovakia.—Excitement continued with regard to the arrest of Professor Tuka, the leader of the extreme anti-Czech wing of the People's party, who was arrested for high treason on January 3. By unanimous decision condemnation was uttered against his arrest in a caucus of the People's party held on January 17 at Bratislava. His release was demanded. Msgr. Hlinka was said to continue his support of the imprisoned leader's cause. A Hungarian newspaper editor, named Jostiak, was arrested on January 19 for complicity with Tuka.

In the election of December 2, 1928, for the Regional Diets, the Opposition groups obtained 2,841,876 votes or 42.54 per cent of them, whilst the coalition parties had 3,850,657 or 57.46 per cent. By law two-thirds of the members of the Regional Diets are elected; one-third is nominated by the Government. This had been already done and followers of the Opposition had been nominated in a very fair proportion. Though the election was to bodies of a purely administrative character, the Socialists succeeded to a certain extent in giving it a political stamp, because the fruits of the reforms carried through by the present coalition were not yet apparent and only the disagreeable side of them had been made very prominent by the Opposition. The Catholic Popular party received 9.01 per cent of the votes cast, whilst at the election for the House of Deputies in 1925 it had obtained 9.72 per cent of the votes polled. So far the leaders of the coalition parties seemed agreed to carry on as hitherto, as the coalition program was still far from having been carried out entirely and the country at large continued to have confidence in the present course.

The period of post-War misery closed with the year 1926. The second half of 1927, and especially the year 1928, were periods of economic boom, which promised to continue for some time, though its zenith seems to have been passed. Taken as a whole the national production was ten per cent above the pre-War level. The circumstance that it nevertheless had not reached the level of the countries not harmed by the War seemed to warrant a certain hope that the economic foundations of the country having been strengthened meanwhile, future depressions, which were sure to come, might not be too harmful. Whilst in the summer of 1927 the unemployment figure was 39,000, in the summer of 1928 it stood at 33,000 and continued to decline, though the season of the year would warrant a rising tendency. The poorer classes were benefited by the Working Peoples' Insurance Act and the Private Employes and Journalists Pensions Act, both of them passed in 1928 and operative as from January 1, 1929.

France.—Myron T. Herrick, United States Ambassador to France, returned to Paris on January 18, after an absence of five months in the United States due to protracted illness. He received a gracious welcome at Havre, and at the railroad station and the offices of the Embassy at Paris. French officials and Americans resident

Insurgent
Victories

Tuka
Case

Political
Situation

Political
Difficulties

Economic
Situation

Varia

in the capital called at the Embassy in numbers to pay their respects.—The investigation into the case of a French consignee of large shipments of sugar from Germany, a part of the reparations in kind, threatened to involve Government officials, who apparently had made no effort to collect the price of the goods from the recipient.—In the discussion of Cabinet policies in the Chamber, the Government received another vote of confidence with a majority of about eighty, following a review of the work of the Ministry of Labor. There was a prospect of extended debate on the Alsatian question in an early session of the Chamber. A number of Deputies had signified their intention of challenging the Premier's attitude in face of the claims of the Alsations for a larger degree of self-government.—Msgr. Pierre Batiffol, well-known authority on Church history, died in Paris on January 17, at the age of sixty-eight.

Germany.—Delegates, to the number of 6,000, from all parts of Germany gathered at Magdeburg to hear the president of the Steel Helmets announce the plan for a popular referendum on the proposal to abolish the parliamentary system and to re-establish the Monarchy. This reactionary organization was said to regard the present uncertain political situation and the popular attitude towards S. Parker Gilbert's reparations report as most favorable for their purpose. Under the auspices of the "Upright" organization, about 2,000 royalists gathered in the Kriegervereinshaus to celebrate the seventieth birthday of the former Kaiser. Prince Wilhelm, eldest son of the former Crown Prince, was hailed as "heir to the imperial throne." In the gallery children displayed a large banner reading "Youth faithful to the Kaiser." At a reading of a message from the exile at Doorn, the entire audience rose and stood reverently. The appearance of the latest book of former Kaiser Wilhelm II, called forth sharp criticism from the Republicans and almost extravagant commendation from the Monarchists. The number of guests expected at Doorn for the celebration of the former Kaiser's birthday was so great that Count Wilhelm Bentinck had difficulty in providing accommodations.

Great Britain.—In the report issued by the Hilton Young Commission, there was recommended the formation of an East Africa Union consisting of the territories embraced by Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika, an area of 700,000 square miles. A novel method of administration of the proposed Union was outlined, something intermediate between a dominion and a colony. In London, the Colonial Office would exercise some control so as to safeguard Imperial interests. A Governor General with his advisory councils would be empowered to coordinate the common affairs of the three territories. In addition, each of the three territories would be directly governed by a provincial Governor and legislative assemblies. The details of the proposals were drawn up to protect the natives as well as the British influence in Africa.

The perennial interest in the project for a tunnel under

the English Channel, connecting England and France, was freshly revived by a plan recently submitted by William Collard. The tunnel proposal was made in reference to the establishment of a railway between London and Paris; the tunnel would be about twenty-four miles long. The total estimated cost of the scheme was given as £189,000,000. Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin expressed himself in favor of a discussion of the tunnel under the Channel. He believed, in view of the time required to carry through the project, that the matter should be considered apart from political affiliations. J. H. Thomas, and other Labor leaders, also recommended the consideration of the tunnel. Opposition to the project has always been led by the military authorities.

Guatemala.—On January 17, a three-day revolt took place in western Guatemala. The sedition was instigated by Juan F. Rivas, Colonel Marcino Casado, and other military leaders. The rebels obtained temporary possession of two provincial cities, but prompt Government action and the summary execution of some of the leaders, enabled the Government to retake the cities and to issue an official report to the effect, "Rebellion totally smothered, situation absolutely normal." It will be recalled that last September President Chacon suspended constitutional guarantees for six months, an action practically establishing martial law, because of alleged seditious activities on the part of the Opposition.

Japan.—On January 18, the Foreign Minister announced to the Cabinet that an agreement had been reached in the tariff negotiations with China. While details of the accord were not published, it was understood that it would include recognition of China's new tariff laws, to go into effect on February 1. Japan is the last of the Powers to reach an agreement with the Nationalists on the tariff. Previously the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, and Italy, among other nations, had conceded tariff autonomy. In a significant speech before the national Diet on January 22, Baron Tanaka, Premier and Foreign Minister, expressed gratification at the reconstruction being accomplished in China. While admitting its sovereignty in Manchuria, he declared that his Government was prepared, while doing "all in its power for the preservation of the principles of the open door and equal opportunity, and desire that the region be made a safe abode for both natives and foreigners," to defend the rights of its nationals, should their interests be put in jeopardy. Concerning the general relations of Japan to China he declared:

What this Government desires in regard to China is that the two nations, mutually understanding the position of the other, should be animated by a spirit of conciliation in their exchange of views and in their efforts for the settlement of various questions pending between them, so that a relationship may be restored between them that will really not only contribute to their mutual well-being, but will be conducive to the tranquility of the Far East and eventually to the progress of world civilization.

English Channel Tunnel

Western Provinces Revolt

China Tariff Accord

Monarchist Agitation

Proposed East African Union

He also lauded the Kellogg Pact, and regarding American relations stated:

It is a cause for congratulation that the bond of friendship, economic and political, with the United States is being more than ever strengthened. Only I wish to add that the matter of the immigration law, which has been pending for the past few years, has not yet been composed. A satisfactory solution of a problem like this must, after all, depend upon mutual good understanding, which, I am fully confident, is growing year after year.

On January 22, Admiral Kanji was appointed Chief of the Japanese Naval Staff, succeeding Admiral Suzuki, who was appointed Lord Grand Chamberlain to the Emperor in place of Count Chinda, recently deceased.

Jugoslavia.—A decree reorganizing the law courts and the judiciary system was signed by King Alexander on January 19. Various projects for further unification of the Kingdom were rumored, so as to deprive its three divisions of their distinctive national characteristics. In an interview on January 20 with Jules Sauerwein, editor of the *Paris Matin*, M. Matchek, leader of the Croat Peasant party, stated that the Croats have no hope or desire for separation from the Serbs but wish simply their own local administration in matters that concern themselves. Objection was raised to Serbian party representatives in the Cabinet, as contrasted with the non-partisan Croat representation, and fear expressed of control by Serbian politicians.

Acting under orders from the Belgrade Government, the police seized, on January 21, the headquarters at Zagreb, in Croatia, of the Croatian Peasants' party, taking possession of the cash box and archives and sealing the doors. Offices of three other parties were similarly closed.—A note was addressed recently by Foreign Minister Marinkovitch to the Rumanian and Czechoslovak Governments requesting that they appoint delegates to prepare agenda for a conference of economic experts.

The Catholic Bishops of Jugoslavia, conferring in Belgrade on January 23, with Dr. Alaupovich, Minister of Public Worship, strongly recommended conclusion of a Concordat with the Holy See before adoption of the pending legal reforms by which the ecclesiastical laws would be made uniform for the entire country. It was also reported that a movement had been started within the Orthodox Church to follow the example of Rumania and Greece in adopting the Gregorian calendar.

Nicaragua.—Activities of the American marines in the department of Jinotega on January 21, resulted in three deaths among the American troopers at the hands of the Sandinista outlaws. In consequence the Managuan Government planned new measures to meet the desultory ambushes of the rebels. Reports from Honduras noted that an agent of General Sandino had stated that in view of the recent rejection by President Moncada of his peace proposal, the General was planning a big offensive in Nicaragua. On January 13, it was an-

nounced that the President had appointed Dr. Roberto Gonzales, Secretary of Public Health, and Antonio Cabrera, Secretary of Agriculture and Labor.

Rome.—In the latter weeks of January the Faithful in Rome began their visits to the basilicas to avail themselves of the first opportunity to gain the special jubilee indulgence granted by the Holy Father in the Bull, "Auspicantibus Nobis," dated January 6, and published shortly thereafter, as a part of the celebration of the Pontiff's fiftieth year in the priesthood. In addition to the usual conditions of Confession and Holy Communion prescribed for plenary indulgences, the jubilee indulgence requires visits to churches, fasting and almsdeeds. For those in Rome the churches specified are three basilicas, St. John Lateran, St. Peter's and St. Mary Major, each to be visited twice, either on the same day or on different days. The fast may be observed on any two days not already prescribed as fast days by the Church. Among good works to be the objects of almsgiving the Holy Father especially recommends the various works for the propagation and preservation of the Faith. Special faculties are granted to confessors during the period of the jubilee. For dioceses outside of Rome the conditions for gaining the jubilee indulgence will be published at a later date through the regular channels.

League of Nations.—At the end of a secret session on January 22, the League of Nations advisory committee on dangerous drugs decided to admit for debate "some time within a week" the so-called American scheme for stipulated supply, involving control of drug factories, which presupposes over-manufacture as the cause of the narcotic evil. As a reform measure, it was urged by Signor Cavazzoni, of Italy. Opposition was anticipated from the representatives of Great Britain and India, Switzerland, and the Netherlands. On January 17, the Economic Committee decided to make a thorough investigation into the international sugar problem just as it has made on the coal question. Experts would be selected.

The present position of Catholics is still the topic of every meeting of clergymen and laymen. AMERICA has printed papers on this theme from editors who know what they are talking about: Richard Reid and Vincent Fitzpatrick. Next week, another militant layman, Patrick F. Scanlan, of the *Brooklyn Tablet*, will bring the discussion up to date and make a practical suggestion in "An Apologetic Bureau in Every State."

"The Grind of the Machine" will be the second of two articles by William B. Gwinnell, unavoidably held over from this issue.

Raymond J. Gray will continue his discussion of an important topic, in "Agencies of Adult Education."

AMERICA

A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1929

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

WILFRID PARSONS
Editor-in-Chief

PAUL L. BLAKELY
JOHN LAFARGE

FRANCIS X. TALBOT
CHARLES I. DOYLE
Associate Editors

WILLIAM I. LONERGAN
JAMES A. GREELEY

FRANCIS P. LeBUFFE, Business Manager

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 - - - - - Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:

Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

Telephone: Medallion 3082

Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts

Waiting for Christ

MORE than twelve centuries ago, Sergius, Bishop of Rome, desiring to foster greater devotion to the ever-blessed Mother of God, did ordain that processions be held on certain of her Feasts. Men learned in the lore of the liturgy cannot tell us how it came to pass that on the Feast of the Purification, the Faithful at Rome began to carry candles, received from the hand of the officiating priest. But the custom grew, and spread widely, until the Catholics of a little island afar off in the Northern seas almost forgot the proper title of this Feast, and called it "Candlemas Day," "the day of the Mass of the Candles."

In this as in many another liturgical growth, the piety of the people of God has invested a mystery of religion with a simple and charming symbolism. In the course of time, a special "Blessing of the Candles," inserted in our modern Missals immediately before the Proper of the day, was sanctioned by the Church. In it, as on Holy Saturday, the toil "of Thy creature, the bee," imparting "to matter the more perfect nature of wax," is commemorated. The burning taper is a type of the light shining from Heaven, the light of grace and love, the light that guides us through the darkness of this present world, the light of the sacred fire of the Holy Spirit which makes plain "what is of avail for our salvation." Led by this light to the Temple, "Simeon, that venerable old man," waited for Christ, praying that his eyes might look upon the Light given unto the revelation of the gentiles and the glory of Israel.

As the years are added, tender memories bring back our first participation in this sacred and venerable ceremony. Once more we are in the dim aisles of the cloistered chapel, in the chill February dawn. We hear the voice of the priest, purple-coped, and smell the incense mingling with the frosty air, and see the flickering tapers lighted by toil-worn hands that now, we trust, rest in Paradise. Our young hearts were waiting for Christ. Like the weaver's shuttle, time has woven our years,

strand after strand, into the texture of life, and still we wait. But not in vain, for we wait in confidence. Some day He will come, and our hearts shall be filled with gladness.

As on Candlemas Day we ask that we may be strengthened to desire His coming and to abide the day, so let us pray that our fellow citizens and all Governments of this world may likewise seek the world's true Light. The world yearns for peace, yet will not forsake the things that stir up wrath and discord. The groans of the oppressed in many nations rise up to Heaven, the wails of mothers who weep and will not be comforted. Evil triumphs because we have not waited for Christ, but have forgotten Him. May we all, children of Our Father in Heaven, turn our faces to His holy temple, even to the sanctuary, to seek the Light which shows us the paths to peace and illumines them.

Savage and Brutal Legislation

IT is almost amusing to follow in the pages of the esteemed *Congressional Record* the debates and squabbles staged by our legislators whenever a problem connected with Prohibition arises. Indeed, as far as the Senate is concerned, a debate on Prohibition can arise, even when irrigation in Arizona is the topic which, by supposition, that august body is considering.

Yet these debates are not useless. They show quite clearly that in spite of prize essays and some hundreds of the thousands of Federal and State police and Prohibition officials, the Federal and State Volstead acts are not self-enforcing. That stormy petrel, Senator Reed, of Missouri, recently drew from the "dry" Senator Harris the admission that enforcement is, and has always been, a farce. In the course of the same debate, he all but reduced to silence Senator Black who could not explain very clearly why, since Prohibition was a "success" in his State, the said State needed more Federal agents to strengthen the hands of the local constabulary.

Tangled and unsatisfactory as the Federal situation is after nine years of the Volstead Act, conditions in many of the States are even more involved. Stung by failure, the more fanatical Prohibitionists are anxious to enforce legislation that may fairly be stamped as savage and brutal. Michigan now has five men and women in the penitentiary for life, and the most hardened criminal of the lot was sentenced for bootlegging on a pitifully small scale. The others appear to have been found guilty on four occasions of possessing small quantities of alcoholic liquors. The savage and brutal character of this legislation, approved by Dr. Clarence True Wilson, and other leading Prohibitionists, becomes clear when it is remembered that the punishment of the criminal who murders his wife and children, and the punishment of the man who is convicted four times on the charge of having in his possession a gill of whiskey, is exactly the same. This is nothing less than fanaticism run mad. As Bishop Gallagher, of Detroit, pointed out in his protest, the alleged law which in imposing a penalty makes no distinction whatever between an act in itself wrong, and an act

wrong because forbidden by statute, is contrary to reason and justice.

Contempt for the fanatical groups which extorted this statute from the State legislature must grow in view of the fact that it has never been enforced except against petty offenders. Detroit, according to credible report, is infested with some of the most active bootleggers and rum runners in the United States. The proximity of the city to the enlightened Dominion of Canada affords these gentry special opportunities of which they take advantage, without the least fear of a life sentence in the penitentiary. In Michigan, as in other jurisdictions, Prohibition legislation is not only savage and brutal legislation, but class legislation enforced only against the poor.

The Child Labor Situation

THE current "Bulletin" of the research department of the Federal Council of Churches contains a survey of child labor in the United States. The brutal exploitation of children, once common in this country, has all but disappeared, but much remains to be done before we can be sure that it will not return. It is not pleasant to know, for instance, that in three of our States, one-fourth of the children between the ages of ten and fifteen, are in the ranks of the wage earners. These figures do not refer to children helping in household tasks or chores, or even to children working on farms, but to children in factories, mills, and shops. Naturally, the illiteracy rate in these States is high.

The National Child Labor Committee has defined child labor as "the work of children under conditions that interfere with the physical development, education, and opportunities for recreation, which children require. It is the working of children at unfit ages, or unreasonable hours, or under unhealthful conditions." If under "education," the religious and moral training of the child be included, this is a definition which the Catholic student accepts. As to what is unfit, unreasonable, or unhealthful, there is ground for honest and intelligent difference of opinion. But there can be no dissent from the general principle that every child should be so protected that, to paraphrase the Canon Law, his physical, mental, and moral welfare is safeguarded and promoted.

What protection the State should afford, its extent and the means by which it is to be secured, again gives rise to honest difference of opinion. This Review opposed the two Federal child-labor Acts, later declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, as well as the pending child-labor Amendment to the Constitution, on the ground that these are wrong ways of doing a good thing. It also believed that the National Child Labor Committee would accomplish its purposes more effectively by forgetting Washington, and concentrating its missionary work in the several States.

The "Bulletin" is hardly fair in its analysis of the opposition to Federal legislation and the proposed Amendment. Our own opposition was not based on any "misapprehension . . . that the Amendment provided for the arbitrary prohibition of child labor," but

on a clear perception that the Amendment vested Congress with "power," to quote the very words of the Amendment, "to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under eighteen years of age." Congress might or might not act to provide "for the arbitrary prohibition of child labor"; but it is fatal to good government to vest any public authority with plenary power on the ground that it will never be abused. Under the Amendment Congress could not only define "labor," and not only "prohibit," but also "limit" and "regulate," any occupation falling within the terms of its definition; and to make matters worse, once an Amendment is in the Constitution, it stays in.

The Committee can have no deeper destestation of child wage slavery than that entertained by this Review. In that we are one, but not in our views as to the most practicable means of preventing the exploitation of children for gain.

Morals and "Big Business"

WE are happy to learn from an address given by Mr. Owen D. Young, at the Park Avenue Baptist Church in New York, that "during the last thirty years the moral standards of business have advanced." Our contacts with "big business" are not intimate; still, industrial history allows the inference that unless the advance in thirty years has been stupendous, no man faithful to the current standards runs any risk of canonization. Hardly twenty years ago, the public mind was aflame with resentment against any and all forms of mergers and combinations. A glance at so accessible a work as Tarbell's "History of the Standard Oil Company" suffices to show that much of this resentment was justified. Groups and combinations drove the weak to the wall without mercy, scoffed at the notion that the Ten Commandments applied to business, and laughed when indignant citizens petitioned legislatures and the courts for relief.

Modern business has at least assumed a virtue if it has it not. Mr. Young does not admit, merely, but strongly contends that if big business is to be profitable business, it must take account of the moral law and "Do you say," he asked, "that there is no question of right or wrong, in the moral sense, in the fixing of a bank rate—that it is a financial matter?" "I know of no act," he replied, "which bristles with more moral problems." He might have added that the list of such acts in business is as long as the list which enumerates every act in business. In everyone of them, directly or indirectly, some moral question will present itself. The solution of such problems as the saving wage, hours of work, and sanitary conditions of work, sick leave, allowance for necessary recreation, and the like, must be decided according to principles of justice and charity—not, as too often is the case, on considerations of financial returns on the capital invested. As a worthy representative of large commercial interests, Mr. Young can with impunity state a principle which, as often as it is uttered by us, brings down upon our heads not vials but whole reservoirs of wrath.

In another point, also, Mr. Young finds an improvement in "big business." A few years ago the owners of a business were held responsible for it; today when shares of stock may be held by thousands of people, "we have completely divorced ownership from responsibility." Responsibility is now vested, according to Mr. Young, in managers, chairmen and presidents, and vast executive organizations. "They alone know the business. They must be held responsible not only for its material welfare but for its moral conduct." In itself, this delegation is not a move toward higher standards, but a method forced by the conditions which Mr. Young finds in modern business, and it gives rise to some of the most difficult problems in the field of morals.

In general, it may be said that every man is responsible for the use of his possessions. The man of small means can easily meet this responsibility; when, however, his wealth becomes so great and varied that he begins, as O. Henry remarks, to compare the size of camels with the eye of a needle, the task becomes exceedingly difficult. He cannot possibly give his personal attention to every one of his interests. It may not even be possible for him to attend the meetings of the boards of which he is a member. He must perforce delegate his control, but *quis custodiet custodes*, who will watch his agents? Only last Spring, the head of a great industrial corporation protested in tears to a Senate investigating committee, that he had never heard of certain atrocities practised not twenty miles from his residence in mills largely owned by himself, but operated by a board of which he was president. Obviously, no man can shift the full burden of responsibility from his own to another's shoulders. Many a rich man has solved the problem by selling his goods and giving them to the poor. Thereby he saves himself, but his laudable act does not show a way out for others who, as a plain matter of fact, are unable to extricate themselves from the toils of ownership.

As long as the present capitalistic system—and we use the phrase in no malign sense—endures, alert, intelligent, and honest managers, to whom responsibility for the moral conduct of "big business" can be safely delegated, under reasonable State supervision, is probably the best that can be hoped for. The system is not ideal, but we do not know what at present can take its place.

Public Service Commissions

UNDER the title "The Breakdown of the Public Service Commissions," the New York *World* published an editorial on January 21 which should be studied by every citizen interested in the proper State control of public utility companies.

New York adopted its Public Service Commission Act in 1907. The purpose was to establish equitable regulation of the utility companies, so as to secure a fair price for the consumer, and a fair return on the investment for the companies. The evils against which the Act was directed were great enough twenty-two years ago, but we fully agree with the *World* that they are worse today. "Regulations as to the cost to the citizen of light, fuel,

power, local transportation, and telephone communication are in a desperate tangle." The fairly common opinion that the Commission is on the payroll of the companies it is supposed to regulate, we do not share. But that the public has lost confidence in the Commission is certain. Whether the lamentable failure that confronts us is due to corruption or impotence, the result is the same.

Of the three definite instances of breakdown cited by the *World*, the telephone-rate case is the most striking. Incredible as it may seem, nine years of investigation and litigation have not brought a solution of the problem of fair rates in the city of New York. Every decision, even when an increase was granted, was met by an appeal to the courts. The testimony runs to 36,500 printed pages "which would make a shelf of books 100 feet in length," the cost has been enormous, and no decision is in sight. The Supreme Court may or may not accept jurisdiction; if it does, the case will run to 1930, and possibly beyond that year.

As we have observed on previous occasions, the regulation of public utility companies is among the most serious problems we must face. It is no purely academic theory of economics or of political science, but a question that goes into every home. Its bearing on the cost of living is direct. Its bearing on the decision whether the vendors of misnamed "utilities"—for, practically, these utilities are necessities—can be made to recognize their responsibility to the public, is equally direct.

Have we so far lost the power of self-government that there is no advocate for the public competent to state the case as effectively as the legal counsel for the corporation?

Let us not complain of the growth of social radicalism as long as we allow this condition to continue.

Woman's Place

TOWARD the end of his long and useful life, the late Cardinal Gibbons said that he saw no reason why he should abandon his belief that woman's place is in the home.

In a recent address, Mr. Isidor Kresel, of the New York bar, while not reaffirming the Cardinal's platform, said that he felt sure her place was not in the professions. "I have yet to meet a leader in either law or medicine. The woman lawyer in particular is a misfit, especially in the courtroom."

Let not the hasty conclusion be drawn that Mr. Kresel attributes this failure to woman's inherent inferiority to man. He merely recognizes that woman has special gifts which, while lost in a courtroom, are of incalculable value in other spheres. As a writer in *G. K.'s Weekly*—whom we take to be G. K. himself—recently said, women are not, as a rule, good citizens. Their ambitions and their interests, he explains, are too personal. "And it is right that this should be so. A home is essentially a personal thing, yet the home is the very basis of our civilization. Once the home is broken up, the whole structure automatically breaks down."

We agree. We also agree with Cardinal Gibbons that woman's place is in the home—unless, of course, God calls her to some other place.

A Papal Slogan: Catholic Action

WILFRID PARSONS, S.J.

THE making of slogans is not often associated with the Popes, and yet each of the last three Popes has coined the most successful slogans of the times. It will be disconcerting to copy writers of metropolitan advertising houses to learn that the ever-ancient and ever-new Church has beaten them at a game they fondly conceive to be of all our inventions most modern and most American. Pope Pius X set the world reverberating with his cry: "Restore all things in Christ!" Benedict XV, whose reign coincided with the World War and its immediate aftermath, gave as his slogan "The Peace of Christ!" And almost on the day of his election Pius XI rounded off the phrase with "The Peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ!" Now he has put another phrase on everybody's tongue in Europe, and that is "Catholic Action."

One of the advantages of this slogan is that it has an enticing sort of sound and yet it leaves something to curiosity and to the imagination. It does not explain itself right off. The Pope has used it in nearly every one of his letters and speeches, and yet I still found people eagerly asking each other, "What is this Catholic Action the Pope speaks about?" The remarkable part about it is that it has even begun to make its entry into diplomatic documents; it is in the new Concordat or treaty between the Holy See and Lithuania.

The first thing of which one becomes conscious, after realizing how thoroughly determined the Pope is that Catholic Action be the keynote of his reign, is that he means it for layfolk. It is not meant primarily for the Bishops and priests, but for all Catholic men and women. He has defined it tersely as "the participation of the layman in the special mission of the Church by cooperating in Catholic things." What are these Catholic things? He recalls that his predecessor St. Peter addressed all Catholics, lay and clerical, as a "royal priesthood," which they share with Christ by the mystical union with Him brought about by their Baptism and Confirmation. From that priesthood, understood in a sense far deeper and more spiritual than used by the Baptists among us, the layman derives, not the special character of the ministry of the word and of grace, but a general duty to spread the Kingdom of Christ by intellectual, social, cultural and economic activities. These are "Catholic things."

It is interesting to see how this duty has been interpreted and put into practice in various countries. It was nothing new that the Pope proposed; but he did propose it in a new way. The emphasis of the two words *action* and *Catholic* proves that. The corporal and spiritual works of mercy have been practised by layfolk in all ages and places. Societies for these purposes have always existed. But the magic words *Catholic Action* have breathed a new spirit into them everywhere.

It is one of the proofs of the Divinity of the Church

that it does not lag behind the age but transforms itself in every generation to meet new modes of thought and expression. It is not, in spite of our detractors, a medieval institution in the twentieth century, a living anachronism; it is a twentieth-century society, and it is everywhere speaking the language of the twentieth century. It must, on peril of losing its hold on men's minds and imaginations.

In Italy, after the War, a group of laymen under the leadership of a priest, Don Sturzo, conceived the idea of renovating the failing Catholic activity of the Italian people through the medium of a political party, the *partito popolare*, dedicated to the social ideals of Leo XIII. It had an instant success: it won 100 seats in the Parliament its first time out. But the Government was weak, social disorder reigned, and the Fascisti came and swept into the dust-heap the broken fragments of the old parliamentary fiasco. The Popular party went with them. But the Holy Father was not asleep. All Catholic activities were instantly organized into one Federation, non-political, but destined sooner or later to have a profound impression on the evolution of Fascism itself. The name of the Federation is *Azione Cattolica*, (Catholic Action). It has found its leaders among educated layfolk and its inspiration in the Mystic Body of Christ.

One of the startling developments of the nineteenth century in Europe was the falling away from the Faith in Latin countries, the de-Christianization of the city masses. This was deliberately undertaken by the Freemasons in France and Italy, and even in Spain, and in whole sections it had a great success. The Socialists took up the work, and the Communists of today are the lineal descendants, through Liberalism and Socialism, of the anti-Christian forces unloosed in Catholic countries by the French Revolution. Anti-clericalism was the slogan; anti-religion the reality. Even northern countries were not free from the apostasy. Just recently in Vienna a city-wide mission was conducted in all the churches; estimates of the number who made the mission varied from ten per cent of the Catholic population, given by Austrians, to five per cent, given by those Germans who were called in to help. I have been told that the situation, for instance in Budapest, would be about the same. The need of the Pope's slogan is apparent everywhere, whether you emphasize it *Catholic* Action or *Catholic Action*.

In Belgium there is a Catholic political party, waging an unequal war with the decadent Liberals and the ever-growing Socialists. The Catholic party was in power for twenty-eight years before the War. Since the War, due in part to internal dissensions and in part to the general social unrest, it has never mustered a sufficient majority to govern alone. Catholic Action has also come to the fore there. It went straight to the source of the evil, the falling-away of the industrialized population in the larger

cities. The "J. O. C.," *Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne* (Young Christian Labor) is one of the most promising of all new works undertaken in Europe, and it has already spread to France. It is a society for young workmen, skilled or unskilled, manned by their own leaders, with Catholic chaplains, and it is carried on with a kind of boisterous gaiety peculiarly well fitted to the Belgian character, and with a sense of humor possible only to those who profess the Catholic Faith. It is only the unorthodox who have any reason for being gloomy. J. O. C. has a great future.

Germany has always been the world's model for organized and vigorous Catholic Action. Its modern manifestation began with the *Kulturkampf*. Alongside the Center party, formed to protect Catholic political rights in the face of the encroachments of State Socialism under Bismarck, the great Catholic layman, Windthorst, formed the *Volksverein*, whose physiognomy has been sociological, which is the modern jargon for the corporal and spiritual works of mercy. The *Volksverein* is in financial straits just now, but then so is all of Germany. The repudiation of the Government's internal debt by inflation of the currency crippled the Church as well as wiping out the old middle class. Better days are ahead, for Germany is working hard. Catholics are more discouraged in Bavaria, perhaps, where a hankering for the King is never absent, than in the North and especially in the Rhineland, where the Republic seems to be accepted by all. The *Caritasverband*, or National Charities, and the *Schul-organization*, a society for educational progress and liberty, are two great national societies where Catholic Action is carried on by layman and clergy side by side.

Before last year's Congress of the *Volksverein* in Magdeburg, there was some apprehension lest the Nuncio would attempt to destroy the large part which laymen have always had in the direction of Catholic works, and place the clergy completely in control. This would have been to destroy that precious initiative from laymen which has always characterized Catholic Action in Germany. Happily, the Nuncio dispelled the fears, and made it clear that the ecclesiastical direction wished for by the Pope is not necessarily a direct one, but one of ideas, or of mere vigilance exercised by authorities.

The situation in France is very different. The Third Republic has not loved the Church, and Masonic ideas and Masonic leaders have been in political command for generations. They deliberately attempted to rob the people of their Faith, and in many places this diabolical, well-financed and unrelenting campaign succeeded, particularly in those dioceses where there had been a long succession of Jansenist and Gallican Bishops. The result has been especially sensational in government, which, as in the United States, is controlled by a small handful of men.

One of the great lay leaders of the country, General de Castelnau, formed the "F. N. C.," *Fédération Nationale Catholique* (National Catholic Federation). It now has more than 2,000,000 members. In the last elections, it proposed a set of questions to all candidates, with the understanding that if the answers were not favorable, they would not have Catholic votes. More than 400 candidates

of various parties gave acceptable answers, and of these more than 200 were elected. That explains the moderation of the present Chamber. Upon my asking the General if his organization is political in scope, the pious old warrior replied in the negative. Its main purpose is educational, to revive the old Christian loyalty where it has lapsed, and to stimulate the courage and vigor of the Faithful. It is not a political party, and its members are free to join any party which does justice to the Church. Catholics are in a minority in France, he explained, and a long hard pull is ahead of them. A competent lecture bureau, composed of educated laymen, is doing yeoman's work. The whole French situation is complicated just now by the resolute refusal of adherents of the condemned Action Française to participate in any Catholic activity, and of course a large number of fervent Catholics were members of that unfortunate society. It is the prayer of the Catholic world that this crisis will quickly pass, for Catholic Action in France will lag until it does.

With this short survey of a part of continental Catholicism, the lines of what the Holy Father means by Catholic Action are sufficiently clear. He is calling the layman to direct participation in the work of the Church. In our times, this work is especially valuable, indeed indispensable, in all the branches of social work, where the influence of the Church in our own country has not been sufficiently felt. A second branch of Catholic Action is, of course, propaganda, which means spreading the Catholic idea, not merely in a defensive way, but in an active attempt to have it permeate the national economy. The third division is spiritual: the article in last week's issue of AMERICA on the laymen's retreat convention in Cincinnati points the way.

More important than all else, however, is the formation of Catholic leaders, with the intelligence and self-effacement to do a great work well, for the cause and not for their own advancement. One of the traditional ways of forming leaders is through the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin, as was done in Vienna before the War, and now in Barcelona, Munich and London, and many other places. The Sodality idea, often misunderstood, is, in its essence, the training of a few, the elite, the leaders. It has always withered and died when an attempt was made to crowd its ranks. It has also failed when its action began and ended in the purely spiritual. A few men or women, rightly trained and directed, can transform a city, when imbued with the sense of their responsibility as leaders, and when their work is mapped out for them along intellectual, cultural, social and economic lines, for the combination of spiritual motive and concrete, practical work, undertaken by a small, enthusiastic group, as the Sodality idea intends, is irresistible.

Beside the pure motive of love of God and our neighbor, intelligence and training are the indispensable factors of Catholic Action. The untrained have no place in this army. If, as Father LaFarge outlined it in these columns a few weeks ago in his article, "The Catholic Round Table," select groups of laymen will band together for study, reflection, and discussion, we shall soon have the leaders for whom the situation is crying aloud.

Charles Carroll, Patriot and Catholic

ELIZABETH S. KITE

THE question has recently been raised whether our nation has gone backwards in the path of religious toleration and fairmindedness since the days when the framers of her Constitution laid down the rule that "no religious test should ever be required as a qualification for office" under it. The question has been asked because in 1792, when it was by no means certain that Washington would "choose to run" a second time, the name of Charles Carroll of Carrollton was suggested as a possible candidate by the then Secretary of War, Dr. James McHenry, and because in replying Alexander Hamilton seemed oblivious to the fact that a religious issue was involved. Hamilton's letter is as follows:

Your project with regard to the President in a certain event, will, I believe, not have an opportunity of being executed. Happily for the public tranquility, the present incumbent, after a serious struggle, inclines if I mistake not, to submit to another election. If this turns out otherwise I say unequivocally, I will cooperate in running the gentleman you mention, as one of the two who are to fill the two great offices. Which of the two may turn up first or second must be a matter of some casualty as the Constitution stands. My real respect and esteem for the character brought into view will ensure him my best wishes in any event.

This reply of Hamilton would lead one to conclude that either there was less bigotry in 1792 than at present or else the character of Charles Carroll was superior to such attacks. The question here raised is not only pertinent in view of the recent campaign but it is of profound historical significance for American Catholicism as well.

The career of Charles Carroll of Carrollton if rightly understood in all its bearings would undoubtedly furnish an answer to this important question; but he still awaits his biographer. By delving a little into contemporary comment, however, additional light is thrown upon the situation in 1792, which is very much more complex than that suggested by Hamilton's letter, at least when that letter is isolated from the literature belonging to the second Presidential campaign of our country's history.

It so happens that at that date Catholicism was not a political issue, owing to the numerical inferiority of its adherents. In the case of Charles Carroll his religion had never been an object of attack; to Alexander Hamilton he was simply one of the staunchest members of the Federalist party upon whose wisdom and prudence the country could rely. His "vested interests" alone placed him squarely in the forefront of the battle waged at the beginning of our national existence to secure a sufficiently strong central government to protect property and personal rights to future generations.

To offset the democratic doctrines professed by Jefferson and his followers, whose advent was even then dreaded as a great national calamity, every atom of Federal strength was needed. No one was so keenly alive to this issue as Alexander Hamilton; therefore no re-

ligious connotation can be assumed for a letter such as that written by him regarding a possible nomination of his revered and honored friend.

Indeed, as regards the great Maryland patriot it was that very Catholicism that in the beginning singled him out as a man of national importance. The attention of the Congress was drawn to him as the one man to whom might be entrusted an extremely difficult and delicate diplomatic mission. It is thus evident that from the beginning of our history bigotry and religious tolerance must not be considered as in themselves issues; rather both are to be looked upon as weapons belonging to the political arsenal kept on hand to be used as occasion demanded. At least this is true of the situation during the Revolutionary period and that immediately following it. As proof we have the attitude of the Revolutionary leaders in regard to Canada.

As all the early efforts to win the Canadians had proved unavailing, it was decided in January, 1776, to send to Quebec a Commission charged with the duty of securing, if not an alliance, at least the neutrality of that Province. Benjamin Franklin, of Pennsylvania, and Samuel Chase, of Maryland, were selected. It was at this time that the name of Charles Carroll of Carrollton was brought forward as that of a man specially fitted to aid in this delicate business.

Prior to 1776 Mr. Carroll had shown himself a zealous defender of liberty against the usurpation of the Royal Governor of his Province. Indeed such outstanding ability had he shown in the early phase of the struggle that he was elected to the assembly at a time when as a "Papist" he was constitutionally incapacitated to take part in the voting. This disability was soon brushed aside. It was long afterwards that he bowed to the wishes of his countrymen and consented to become a member of the Canadian Commission. His cousin, John Carroll, a Jesuit, was also chosen to accompany them. The fitness of these two men for the task assigned them, as related by John Adams in a lengthy letter to a friend, was that both were "gentlemen of learning and ability" who had enjoyed from early youth the advantages of a "liberal education in France" and both spoke "the French language like ours."

In the cause of American liberty [continues Adams, speaking of Charles Carroll] this gentleman's efforts and perseverance have been so conspicuous that he is said to be marked out for particular vengeance by friends of administration; but he continues to hazard his all, his immense fortune, the largest in America, and his life. . . . His abilities are very good, his knowledge and learning extensive. I have seen writings of his that would convince you of this. You may perhaps before long hear more about them.

Elsewhere in the same letter Adams says regarding the religion of Mr. Carroll:

. . . what is perhaps of more consequence than all the rest, he was educated in the Roman Catholic Religion and still con-

tinues to worship his Maker according to the rites of that church. . . . These three gentlemen [that is Franklin, Samuel Chase and Mr. Carroll] compose a committee which I think promises great things.

The enthusiasm of Mr. Adams for his Catholic fellow-patriot cannot be doubted. Conscious that Congress had badly bungled the matter in its attempts to reach the heart of the Canadians, Adams was overjoyed at the thought that the key to the situation had at last been found. The letter continues: "But we have done more. We have empowered the Committee to take with them another Gentleman of Maryland, Mr. John Carroll, a Roman Catholic priest and a Jesuit."

One can almost hear John Adams chuckle. He was so very proud of himself and so sure that Canada would be won. It would have been well for his future reputation as a discerning and intelligent man, however, if he had stopped the eulogy of his Catholic friend right here and not attempted to go into particulars as to what would be the course of action of the American Jesuit after he reached his destination. Enthusiasm, however, hurried him forward on the wings of imagination. He says:

This Gentleman will administer Baptism to the Canadian children and bestow Absolution upon such as have been refused it by the torified Priests of Canada. The Anathama's [sic] of the Church so terrible to the Canadians having had a disagreeable effect upon them.

The danger regarding the British Province of Quebec at the beginning of 1776 was felt to be very real. John Hancock and John Adams both bear witness to this. In this connection Adams says further in regard to Mr. Charles Carroll, "This Gentleman's Character, if I foresee aright, will hereafter make a greater figure in America."

This prophecy was correct. On the return of Mr. Carroll from Canada his native Province sent him as delegate to Congress where he arrived in time to sign his name to the immortal Declaration, and from that time forward he continued to take an active part in national affairs, though he frequently absented himself in order to carry out duties assigned him in connection with affairs in his own State.

At this point it is well to pause in order to call special attention to the significant fact that religious toleration in the United States owes its origin on the one hand, to the French explorer, Jacques Cartier, who founded Quebec and to the Catholic missionaries who followed in his train, and on the other, to Lord Baltimore and the Jesuits who established themselves in Maryland, and that it should have been to the interrelation of these two Catholic communities, the one French and the other English, that the Church in the United States owes its liberty. Nor should it be forgotten that an important element in the situation was the deep political issue involved in the acquisition of Catholic Canada by Great Britain at a moment when her Protestant British subjects were coming into the dawning consciousness of their own power.

Who could have foretold that the Colony founded by Lord Baltimore, notwithstanding the intervening years of persecution and civic degradation, should have been able

to produce two representative statesmen who in the political as well as the ecclesiastical world were able to respond to their country's call as did Charles and John Carroll of Maryland? In estimating the rapid growth of the Catholic Church in the United States these varied elements must all be taken into consideration. Nor must there be omitted from such an estimate the personal character and accomplishments of these men, which at all times were such as produced a profound impression upon their contemporaries whatever the shades of political opinion or the bias of religious beliefs.

The Catholicism of Carroll, together with his knowledge of French conditions and language having brought him into political prominence, it might be expected that the same qualifications would have made him equally serviceable when it was question of forming alliance with the Catholic Powers of France and Spain. No evidence exists, however, that he ever took part in these transactions, although it is highly probable that more positions of responsibility and dignity were offered him than the records, today available, are in a condition to show.

So many "legends" have crept into the story of America's foremost lay Catholic citizen, that one hesitates to quote unauthenticated statements. It seems probable, however, that in 1776 his name was mentioned as Commissioner to accompany Franklin to France and that he refused. One of his eulogists, Miss L. L. Payne, says in this connection that Carroll felt that the very fact of his religious sympathy with France was a reason for remaining in the background at home. He felt that if it were known that a Catholic was trying to influence a Catholic king to help the country, a cry of "Romanism" would go up from all over the land.

Diligent search through all available documents of the period has failed to afford outstanding evidence of the above interesting suggestion. From another source, however, we have contemporary proof that a similar honor was offered to and refused by Carroll in connection with the presidency of Congress. Conrad Alexander Gerard, first French Minister Plenipotentiary to the United States, writing to his court on November 10, 1778, said:

Congress is embarrassed with the choice of a new President. . . . A man is needed for that place who is active and who has talent and whose fortune will permit him to make a good appearance. *The wishes of all unite in the person of Mr. Carroll of Maryland* [italics inserted], who is a Catholic, but it is doubted if he will accept.

As is well known, John Jay, of New York, became President of Congress in December, 1778, following the resignation of Henry Laurens, of South Carolina.

The above incidents throw an interesting light upon the character of this Revolutionary patriot. Evidently it was a fixed principle with him to accept no position of honor where duty as a Catholic and a citizen was not involved. After 1778 his name no longer appears on the Journals of Congress. Satisfied that the affairs of his country were in good hands now that the alliance with France was in active operation, he preferred serving in the Maryland Assembly rather than in Congress. Not

until called upon by the Federalist party after the adoption of the Constitution did he again take part in national affairs.

It would require very deep research to discover to what extent the nation which placed Washington at the head of its Government in 1789 is indebted to America's great Catholic patriot for the stability which was then given to its Constitution. Undoubtedly his influence is far more profound than has up to the present been suspected. The deep concern which animated him regarding the future of the country and the solidity of his convictions cannot be doubted. The letters which remain afford incontestable proof. Nevertheless he still preferred to hold himself in the background, and this prudence only strengthened the esteem in which he was held by all political leaders. In the meantime his vast wealth, his known sobriety and thrift, his social prominence placed him personally above attack. McHenry wrote of him to Hamilton in 1800: "He [Charles Carroll] is the wisest, most prudent and best man in the United States."

Political rivalries, however, were not absent even at the very beginning of our history as a nation. August 11, 1792, McHenry wrote Hamilton in regard to the possible nomination of Charles Carroll:

I mention Mr. Carroll as proper to be brought forward to oppose a man whom I suspect the anti-Federal interests will unite in supporting, in case of an opportunity. I calculate that Mr. Carroll will not succeed, but it may produce more votes for some man who ought. I mean also that it should operate to detach Mr. Carroll from Mr. Jefferson, whose politics have in some instances infected him. In this, however, you will understand, should it be an eligible line of politics, that I do not mean to be an actor. The interest you feel in it, more than any other consideration, would induce me to take a little trouble. . . . I have been with Bishop Carroll whose friendship and intimacy I enjoy. *He has much greater control over the minds of the German Catholics than Charles* [italics inserted], and I believe that description of men will vote for Campbell. . . .

From the above letter it would appear that political interests were uppermost in McHenry's mind in naming Carroll on this occasion and that his interest was negative: "To give more votes to one who ought."

Let it be noted, too, that it was the Bishop and not his cousin who controlled the Catholic vote. The line about Jefferson's influence is of special significance. In 1791 the principle of human equality advocated by Jefferson undoubtedly appealed to Carroll's Catholic mind and there are a few letters of this period that suggest as much. As the French Revolution developed, however, fears for a repetition of those scenes in America led him more and more to repudiate Jeffersonian ideas and to consider their introduction at that time as distinctly dangerous. With the advent of Democracy to power in 1800 Carroll definitely left for the second time the realm of national politics, though never to the end of his long life did he cease to take a vital interest in public affairs.

As regards the suggested nomination for President in 1792 there is no evidence that Carroll himself was ever informed. Still less is it probable that he could have been induced to accept had the offer actually been made. "The wisest, most prudent and best man in the United States," to quote McHenry again, would certainly not

have been caught in such a political snare. Regarded as a whole, his career presents the remarkable spectacle of a man in public life who had no enemy. His prominence, therefore, never was allowed to waken the consciousness of a different religious affiliation existing in the background. Catholic he was and all the world knew it, but no one could attack him on the score of religion. Who shall dare say summing up the past, to what extent we as American Catholics owe the religious freedom we enjoy to the wisdom and tact of the great Revolutionary patriot, Charles Carroll of Carrollton?

Graham Bread and Coffee

MARY GORDON

IN some families the days of the week are known thus: Monday, the Holy Trinity; Tuesday, St. Anthony; Wednesday, St. Joseph; Thursday, The Blessed Sacrament; Friday, The Passion of Our Lord; Saturday, The Blessed Virgin.

So, it was St. Joseph's Day. The last bell for eight o'clock Mass was ringing. We turned the corner on our way home from an earlier Mass. The sun, with that thin veil it seems to wear mornings of hot, sultry, stuffy days, met my blinking gaze with a bored (or was it baleful?) unflinching stare. Happy in the knowledge that in a few moments we would be in our own old shady yard we tried, for a split second, to look it down.

Thankfully and with a wee prayer for the folk who would have to work under its pitiless rays all through the day we started to mount the steps of our side porch . . . and stopped.

"I have been knocking at your door for quite a while, lady," said the shabby man who confronted us.

"Come up on the porch and sit down," I answered, flinging to the sun (as there were no winds) all the advice ever given about being too free with strangers, especially men. "We have not breakfasted, either. We are hungry, too. A cup of coffee will do us all good; renew our faith and love and trust in God," I ventured as I left him and started the percolator.

A bowl of coffee with "oodles" of milk and cream; four thick slices of graham bread generously buttered, some home-made cookies and an iced cantaloupe were set before my weary-looking, self-invited guest, and a blue and white checked napkin was spread across his overalled, skinny knees.

"There," I said in a voice that sounded a bit rough for a female.

"Eat! My beloved mother, dead almost three years now, always told the seven of us that whenever one fed a hungry person he fed Christ Himself. Eat . . . and God bless you. God knows you are welcome." I went back into the kitchen without looking at him, as I would not want him to scrutinize me had the case been reversed.

"But what if he had been an atheist or a gangster, or, both?" you remind me.

Taking a chance is one of the things that makes life a really joyous adventure. Besides, our home is not in an isolated district.

I want you to see this man as I saw him that morning. Not much to look at as men go in 1929. Not a collar-ad type of man by the wildest stretch of imagination. Once he had been a man of unusual height; now, lean to emaciation, faded blue eyes that had looked too long upon the hot stones in a gravel pit or the burning sands of the railroad road-bed. A pair of overalls, jacket to match, blue shirt, felt hat that had never reposed upon the shelf of any of our exclusive "Stores for Men," a pair of inexpensive, stout shoes . . . can you see him? His face, neck and hands were sun-burned a beet red, accenting the faded blue of his sun-blurred eyes.

He looked tired; tired to exhaustion. He wore the air of a beaten man, that early old-age look of the unsuccessful. If there is anything on God's beautiful earth more pathetic to see than the eyes of a man who faces, and realizes and admits the fact that he is beaten in the game of life . . . I do not wish to see it.

(Across my mind like lightning's flash flares now the memory of a young girl I met one cold, wet, First Friday morning as I hurried to five o'clock Mass. She was not going thither. She was homeward bound.

Homeward bound after literally "walking back" eleven miles. Disheveled, half-hysterical, ashamed . . . her eyes . . . ah, dear God . . . her eyes? That however is irrelevant here.)

But it was the sun-blurred not the beaten look in the eyes of my uninvited guest that forced me to do for him.

Have you ever, gentle and otherwise reader, seen that look in the eyes of a laboring man? It comes from long, hard hours of work under the blistering sun; the pitiless sun whose fiery glare casts back from the hot sands heat waves and a blinding reflection that seems to leave a thin film over the eyes.

Back on Time's road another man had just that same sun-blurred look in his steel-grey, eagle eyes all one summer. Times were very hard that summer. There was a houseful of small children and a new baby had recently arrived. Men, skilled workmen, were idle. To remain at home with his family this other man had worked for three almost unendurable hot months, as had my recent guest, out under the glare of the blinding sun.

But we are getting away from my guest! Where were we? Oh, yes . . . I had just finished trying to tell how he looked as he stood upon our porch, fingering his hat, his sensitive face quivering from the humiliation he must have known at being anyone's uninvited guest.

Tired, sweaty, soiled; not much sex appeal there! Not even any sox appeal, for his overalls showed plainly a sockless ankle. Yet, he was cast in the image of a man and surely worth preserving.

"It's a long time since I used a napkin or since anyone waited on me," he stammered.

"God meant us to wait on each other," I told him and went to my own breakfast that tasted strangely good.

"More coffee?"

"You gave me a big bowlful."

"The second is always better than the first."

A little later: "Can you drink any more?"

"No, ma'am," he said with the faintest flicker of a smile way back in those sun-blurred eyes.

"Out of work?"

"Yes, ma'am. I did have work, on the railroad. I walk with a little limp. Lost the fore half of my foot when I was thirteen. Got too close to a reaper while helping my father. It got to bothering me lately. The heat did it. I never mind it unless I get bushed. My boss said it was all right with him. He said he knew I was doing the best I could. But two of the men I was working with kicked. They said I did not keep up my end. But they never said that until I refused to go to a meeting with them where a fellow kept telling us there was no God. After that they would not work with me. The boss was awful sorry but he had to let me go. You can see how it was?" apologetically.

I was speechless, for his tale had rung true.

My guest resumed: "That's the way nowadays, ma'am. Lots of men and women, too, are like wolves. They are quick to snap at the weaker ones in the pack. And when folk are strong and well they maybe don't understand how hard it is for someone else who ain't so young or able as they are. This ain't the first time I have been let out on account of my foot. I get along better in the winter. I never could stand the heat."

Silence. What could I say? What could I do?

Again over memory's screen a thought came scudding: "I met Him today, in the crowded street. The Christ on the Cross Who died. But the marks of the nails were not in His feet. Nor the gouge of the spear in His side."

"Just around the corner of the block is a Catholic church," I told him in a voice that sounded a bit rough for a female. "I don't know your religious affiliations. They do not matter, here. But this we do know. If you go to the rectory and tell the pastor or his assistant what you have just told me one of them will find you work. It may not be permanent but it will aid you for a time, until God sees that something else turns up."

"That sounds like a fairy tale; too good to be true," he said dully. "But I will go and be glad to."

He stooped for his hat, straightened and tried to thank me, but without warning his gift of expression deserted him.

"In God's eyes we are brother and sister," I told him. "Do not try to thank me. Thank God. He never closes the door of hope or opportunity tight upon any of His children."

* * * * *

This is the Blessed Virgin's Day as I write. It was St. Joseph's day that I served graham bread and coffee to one of our less fortunate brothers. And this morning hastening to seven o'clock Mass I saw him mowing the pastor's lawn.

Strange how fairy tales sometimes come true!

The uninvited guest is to have the janitor's work for the next four weeks while the janitor and his wife go on their vacation to her parents back in New York City.

After hearing this, the second prayer I said was the prayer for priests. You have seen it perhaps framed on the wall in some house whose son is a priest.

Opportunity for the Negro

JOHN LAFARGE, S.J.

WITH the turn of the New Year, both major political parties begin to look to future accomplishments, rather than to past records. With each successive campaign, certain fields of human interests which have long been looked upon as a special hunting ground for votes, are found to yield less and less to partisan treatment. The farm issue is an example.

The treatment of the Negro has been one of the slowest of these issues to leave the realm of mere opportunism. There is no use discussing which political party may have sinned least in this regard. After all, it is largely a matter of local politics. Nevertheless, the attitude of political leaders can hasten or retard the just solution of many matters. Such leaders, moreover, will find that their own interests, even from a partisan point of view, will be best served in the long run by getting the whole system "out of hysteria into scientific and factual approach" (James Weldon Johnson). Neglect of the facts, neglect of the community of interests that exists for both races, will bring either party eventually into a blind alley, a hopeless confusion, that is poorly bought at the price of some passing victory at the polls.

If this is true for politicians, as such, it is vastly more true for Catholics as such. The situation in which the colored man finds himself in this country, remarked a distinguished member of our Hierarchy, was not made by Catholics. If, however, we are not responsible for the situation, why act as if we were enfeoffed to it? Why should we fear to discuss it in our own terms, to forge our own definitions, and to state boldly what we, as Catholics, know should be and must be the solution, based on Catholic social teaching?

For such hesitancy on our part there are two apparent reasons and one real cause.

The first apparent reason is that the problems of the American Negro must be treated in cooperation with the many non-Catholic agencies that are working for his benefit. For Catholics, it is said, to strike out for themselves, would mean an isolated, unrelated effort, whereas we need to join forces. Such an objection, however, rests on a misconception.

Were Catholic effort generally looked upon as embarrassing or hindering the good work already being done by these various agencies, we might hesitate, even knowing, as we should, that such a fear would be unfounded. Such, however, is not the general view. Experience can testify that independent Catholic effort and original Catholic enterprise towards alleviating the racial situation is welcomed as strengthening the common cause.

Such an impression was conveyed at the recent National Interracial Conference held in Washington, December 25-27, 1928. The Conference was a clearing house for findings and opinions on the principal phases of the bi-racial problem, between representatives of most of the major agencies, educational, social, religious, etc.,

in the United States that are in any way concerned with Negro welfare, and was hailed as the most important gathering of that kind ever held in this country.

Some nine topics were treated: population, health, education, industry and agriculture, recreation, housing (including the segregation question), law observance and administration, citizenship, and race relations. The most prominent investigators, of both races, of these topics presented the results of two years' careful preparation, and especially of one year's minute, painstaking investigation under the guidance of Charles S. Johnson, of the National Urban League, and Graham R. Taylor, of the Commonwealth Fund. Some of the results of this investigation were published recently in the volume for November, 1928, of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, entitled "The American Negro." With attendance limited strictly to delegates, frank discussion took place after each presentation.

Without going into details of the proceedings, the general impression may be recorded that the facts alleged sufficed to clear away a number of encumbering myths.

Lightly accepted generalizations as to the mental ratings of the Negro, abnormal tendency to criminal acts, etc., fail of proof when confronted with thorough analysis and the consideration of circumstances of environment, early training, employment conditions, etc. On the other hand, no theory, however plausible, can excuse inaction in view—to mention a few instances—of the shortage of hospital facilities for the colored, the shortage of doctors, of facilities for internship and for nurse training. To quote the report on Health:

Statistics furnished by the American Medical Association show that there are in the United States 6,807 hospitals of all kinds with bed space of 853,318, and an average of 671,830 patients daily. This gives one bed for each 139 of the population, but how do these figures apply to the Negro people? There are available to them 210 hospitals of all kinds, with a total bed space of 6,780 or an average of one bed for each 1,941 persons, or, to bring the figures down to the individual, each white citizen of the United States has 14 times as good a chance at proper hospital care as has the Negro. In the matter of caring for tuberculosis patients, a disease to which Negroes especially fall prey, the condition is still worse. A Negro with tuberculosis has only one twenty-fifth the opportunity for sanitarium care that a white man has.

In the face of these facts we are forced to wonder why our death rate from certain diseases is not 14 to 1 instead of 2 to 1, as statistics show.

Nor can they excuse the discrepancy in the provisions made, in the expenditure of common, public funds, for Negro education. To quote the report further:

Although the Negro school population [in one State] is approximately 42 per cent of the total school population, Negroes receive approximately 5.5 per cent of the fund disbursed for instructional service; 1.4 per cent of the money disbursed for transportation of pupils to and from school; 4.7 per cent of the money disbursed for health purposes; .08 per cent of the money disbursed for libraries; and 11.4 per cent of all expenditure for educational purposes.

The record, on the other hand, of the State of North Carolina is one of the brightest, and is in accordance with increasing enlightenment of public opinion as to the need of elementary justice in this respect.

Short school terms, unenforced attendance laws, unnatural obstacles to land ownership on the part of Negroes in the rural districts, due to soil exhaustion and involved credit systems, with migration as a result, the enforced dropping out of colored labor from industries traditional long before the Civil War, such as carpentry, bricklaying, painting, etc., the absence of apprenticeship and vocational-training facilities, demoralization from lack of proper recreational facilities, enforced housing in proximity to vice districts in the cities, over-crowding as a result of segregation, obstacles to home ownership, lack of protection for colored womanhood, a double standard of treatment in the law courts, are but a few of the many instances which show the length of the path still to be trod. Moreover, when examined, these disabilities show the hopeless contradictions which affect any policy that attacks the fundamental rights of men whether as citizens, in a political and legal sense, or as human beings, needing the common benefits of common utilities and agencies. For, turn the matter as we will, we cannot separate these various disabilities from political and social injustice. Deprive a man of his vote, deprive him of his share in the benefits of the public funds, subject him to unnatural conditions as to freedom of living conditions, travel or employment, and you naturally saddle him with physical hardships as a consequence of discrimination.

Such facts, then, and many more, were carried back by the delegates to their respective constituencies, to spread knowledge and apply interpretation as best they might. Yet the very efficiency of the Conference shows that a need was felt for a more reasoned social philosophy than traditional Protestant piety could afford. The need of a more objective basis than mere good will and kindly feelings was hinted at in a roundabout manner by Dr. Herbert A. Miller, of Ohio State University, when he stated that hope for better things was based on "the inevitable," not on faith in "ideals"; understanding "ideals" rather as emotional aspirations than as reasoned principles. Hence the inference that the aid of Catholic social doctrine to supply such a basis will be welcomed.

It may be urged, in the second place, that our social institutions are too crystallized, too rooted in human passions, to allow any reasonable hope of adjusting human relationships so as to fit the Catholic ideal. If the Protestant majority, with its wealth, its political and social prestige has still so many obstacles to combat, what can the Catholic minority do?

In reply to this we can say that social institutions may be crystallized, but the crystals can be dissolved. While they last, such institutions seem overwhelming. The ordeal by fire, polygamy, dueling, slavery, each appeared inevitable, unchangeable in their day. To each the Church applied the solvent of her teachings.

A generation ago war was universally accepted as the only practical instrument of national policy. Today fifty-

five nations are in the process of renouncing it. Progressive disarmament, a chimera in the 'nineties, is sober calculation in 1929. Yet war is rooted in the most elemental human passions.

Few changes that yet need to take place in race relations could be much more sweeping than some of the changes that have already occurred in the status of the Negro in the United States since the days of slavery. Nor could they greatly exceed the alterations that have revolutionized our home life and our public life since the urbanization and industrialization of this country. Since the Catholic ideal is not revolutionary, but rests on a solid basis of the facts of human existence, it is hard to see why its fulfilment should be considered impossible merely because it involves change. Nor does the fact that we are a minority count for much in the long run; since, as was well put by the speaker just quoted, "new ideas come down from the class to the mass." It is a minority in any case which ultimately settles things.

The only true difficulty in realizing Catholic ideals is simply that of sufficient spiritual caliber to form such an effective minority. The real work will be done always by men and women who will devote to the task their personal service. Catholic priests and Sisters of our different home-mission bodies, as well as notable individuals amongst the diocesan clergy, have long set such an example. Their lives are consecrated to the work. A few days ago Father Alonzo J. Olds, of Washington, rounded out his silver jubilee as pastor of one of the most harmonious and progressive colored congregations in this country.

Of late, Catholic laymen have been aroused to the fact that the colored man's opportunity is the white man's prosperity: that the greatest menace to our civilization is the man deprived of an opportunity because he has not been trained to acquire it. Large-hearted men and women are aroused to the need of providing such instruction and training to colored youth as will offer that opportunity. Nor can the Negro's rights as to citizenship, housing, and public utilities and public agencies be neglected.

If our missionaries can thus cast aside all opportunism in their consecration to the Catholic ideal, surely our laymen will follow suit, and put new heart into all good men who recognize the possibilities and achievements of the colored race, by striking out boldly for a social and economic structure based not on self-interest and indifference, but on justice and charity for all.

REPOUSSE

I bring you silver, cool as mountain lakes,
Wrought patiently in that clean-repoussé
Whose hammers beat and beat while beauty breaks
And blooms like spring, a little day by day.
I bring you silver rich in rare design,
But more than that, I bring you hammered hours
From some one's life made delicate to line
And curve and beauty caught in frozen flowers.
I bring you one high counsel with my gift
Of silver. Emulate its careful art
Until against your life bright patterns lift
From beauty's hammer beating in your heart.

C. T. LANHAM.

Sociology**A Letter from Louisville**

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

TO the issue of AMERICA for December 29, 1928, I contributed a criticism of certain unethical principles contained in an elaborate booklet published by the Louisville Industrial Foundation, under the title, "Louisville, Center of American Markets." The rebuke of a Louisville editor, who interpreted my remarks as a condemnation of everybody in Louisville, will be found in our correspondence column. The gentler expostulation of a prominent Louisville attorney, I give herewith, and add some further reflections.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

My attention has been called through some comment in the *Record* to your article, "Liberal Louisville," which appeared in the issue for December 29, 1928. There is no city in the country where such cordial relations exist between employer and employe as here in our city, where it has been the rule for a great many years to reconcile differences, so that we have not had any strikes or lock-outs of any consequence for years and years.

Regarding the wages paid by our industries, there can hardly be any better indication than the Board of Trade's statistics showing that the purchasing power of the people of Louisville, with a couple of exceptions, is better and higher per capita than any other city in the country, and when business is not good we find traveling salesmen out of New York rushing to Louisville to get business that they could not get elsewhere.

Referring to what you call a "scheme of philosophy which is at once Christian and calculated to promote the public welfare," which looks on "the operations of labor and capital as essentially a cooperative process," and whose "ideal is a just and equitable distribution of risks and profits, and until that ideal, steadily sought, can be reached capital must make a living wage the first charge upon profits," let me say that we have in our city a manufacturer who introduced this very same system many years ago. Doing an international business, his plan of partnership is known throughout the country. Many employers here feel that the success of this company is largely on account of this partnership plan, and at least a score of other industries have some similar plan in operation. I doubt very much if there is any other city in the country with relations between employer and employe more close to your ideal. Regretting that you did not make a better study of our industrial conditions, I beg to remain,

Yours very truly,

Louisville.

S. J. BOLDRICK.

Dear Judge Boldrick:

The Editor has shown me your courteous letter of January 14. You regret that I "did not make a better study of our industrial conditions." May I retort by regretting that "Louisville, Center of American Markets"

was not revised by some critic with your Christian spirit and insight?

If you will refer to my article, you will see that it is not, and does not profess to be, "a study of industrial conditions" in Louisville, or anywhere else. It is an application—"study" is too pretentious a word—of some elementary principles of Catholic philosophy to certain statements contained in a booklet, "Louisville, Center of American Markets," published by the Louisville Industrial Foundation. These statements refer to (1) the employment of women in gainful occupations, (2) the "open shop," (3) "family expense" and the "saving wage." Let me discuss these points briefly.

1. Christian philosophy regrets the presence of women wage earners in the industrial world. It tolerates this presence as necessitated by prevailing economic conditions, but does not approve it, and the reason is plain. The married wage earner means no family, or a small family, or a neglected family. The care of the home is a task that absorbs the energy and good will of even the most capable and best-disposed woman. Only in the very exceptional case, can she leave it to engage in gainful occupation, and maintain the fostering care without which it may be a house or a tenement, but can never be a home.

For the unmarried woman, gainful occupation all too often means late marriage—a most ominous social sign today, since its sequence is a decreased birth rate—or physical unfitness for maternity. It may also induce a certain spiritual unfitness, occasioned by blunted sensibilities consequent upon the mingling of the sexes in the business world. Neither the factory, the shop, nor the office is a school of delicate modesty, reserve and chastity.

Hence the ideal of every valid social philosophy is an economic order which eliminates woman as far as possible from the necessity of gainful occupation, so that she may devote herself fully to the exercise of the functions, exclusively hers, on which the stability of the home and of society is conditioned. There have been great nations without factories, but no people ever rose to greatness on factories and wrecked homes.

In view of these truths, I have no language strong enough to portray adequately an industrial association which repudiates Christian social principles, to hold up as "liberal," and even as desirable, conditions which every well-ordered community must, on peril of its very life, strive to abolish. To the mind trained in the social philosophy of the Catholic Church, as set forth notably in the labor Encyclicals of Leo XIII, the language used by the Louisville Industrial Foundation is horrible and revolting.

2. I know of the cooperative scheme adopted by Mr. P. H. Callahan. Whether the Foundation also knows of it, is dubious. At least there is no mention of it in the sixty pages of the Foundation's booklet.

This, however, is quite clear: it is not to a city in which healthy cooperation between worker and employer is the general rule, that the Foundation invites manufacturers.

Quite the contrary. The Foundation invites them to a city in which there are no labor unions, and in which—possibly by consequence—the manufacturer is free to work his women employees sixty hours a week.

3. In one point I shall probably continue to differ with you. You refer to "the Board of Trade's statistics" to show that "the purchasing power of the people of Louisville . . . is higher per capita than any other city in the country." You do not favor me with these statistics, nor does the Foundation. Since they were not used in my article, they cannot concern me here; in any case, my position is the following.

The Foundation asserts, broadly and without limitation, that in Louisville "wages cover all expenses and leave a surplus." It alleges in proof that while the average annual "expense per family" for the whole country is \$1,434.27, for Louisville it is only \$1,268.24. I contend that this proof "is the reverse of convincing," and for these reasons:

(a) "Expense per family" is by no means synonymous with "living wage," much less with "saving wage," as the Foundation seems to think. A family in dire need of food, coal, clothing, and other commodities costing \$100, may report a "family expense" of \$50, because when it has expended \$50, it has expended its last penny. For the other commodities, it must either go in debt, or—as is the case with uncounted wage earners—go without. This simple example indicates the essential difference between "expense per family" and "living wage."

(b) "Expense per family" may be less or greater in one community than in another, because of the different standards of living. To compare localities, without allowing for these differences, can lead to wholly fallacious results. The Foundation, as I pointed out, should have proved its contention by collating the *average expense* per family in Louisville with the *average wage income* per worker. It is obvious that income must be compared with necessary expenditure, before we can know whether the wage is "living," "saving," or "insufficient."

(c) The sole clue to average wage income afforded by the Foundation is its statement (p. 10) that in Louisville 55,332 factory employees receive a yearly wage of \$66,096,544.15. This means that the average annual wage per worker is about \$1,194.54. But by the Foundation's own figures the "expense per family" in Louisville is \$1,268.24!

Clearly, then, the annual expense per family is *greater* by \$73.70 than the annual wage of the factory worker, and that on the Foundation's own showing. How can he make up this deficit? One way, suggested by the Foundation, is to put his wife to work in a factory for sixty hours a week. In that case, how can he have a family, or, if he has one, how shall it be cared for?

The normal unit of society includes a father, the breadwinner, and a mother whose Divinely delegated task is to care for the little ones growing up about her knees. A modern economic view, abnormal but common, rejects that unit. A family is a group of workers, engaged in gainful occupation, supported by the combined wage of the lot. This seems to be the view of the Foundation, since its

figures show that the annual wage of a factory worker is insufficient to support a family.

I am here using the very methods on which the Foundation seems to rely. Personally, I have no great faith in such statistics, unless they have been gathered for a comparatively small area (say for one district and a single industry) and carefully evaluated for excess and defect. By themselves, averages mean little or nothing. While the total annual income of 100 families in a district may be \$250,000, it would be rash to conclude that the actual annual income of every family is \$2,500. The difference between income, and the distribution of income, is exactly the difference between opulence, competence, and penury. For instance, the total income may be confined to one family, or shared equally by a dozen, or ten families may take ninety per cent of it. Obviously, then, we get completely outside the sphere of real conditions when we identify a mathematical *average* with an *actuality* applying to every member of a group. John, James and George have six dollars between them. The average is two dollars, but, in cold fact, John possesses one dime, and James a penny. George has \$5.89.

As to the wail of the *Record*, that I have held up to scorn and ridicule the people of a whole community, I believe that the fourth line of the fourth paragraph of my article sufficiently dissociates the citizens of Louisville from complicity in the paganism of the Louisville Industrial Foundation. Permitting myself further comment, I express some surprise that the publication of these pagan principles, completely at variance with Catholic social principles, was passed over by the *Record* without censure, and that I, who condemned them, was selected for attack. I do not hold up the people of Louisville to scorn and ridicule, but the Foundation, I think, does, and the *Record* has no word of protest.

Do you remember how, in "My New Curate," Daddy Dan shocks young Father Letheby by asking why it is worse to denounce a crime than to commit one? I quote from memory, but give, I trust, the substance of a remark pertinent to the attacks of some of my critics.

Education

Are the Laity Catholics?

CRICKET WAINSCOTT

SINCE the Wednesday after the first Monday of November, 1928, I have had many disappointments. One of them is that the reaction to the articles, published in this Review, on the parish versus the diocesan system for our elementary schools, began so feebly that within a month it became null and void.

Can it be that we Catholics are not interested? Yet there is hardly a question that is of greater importance. It has been well said that although we have no national church in this country, we have a national religion, and its chief activity is devotion to the elementary schools. One can hardly pick up a newspaper without reading how some city has just authorized a new bond issue, or how a school board has adopted a progressive building pro-

gram which will cost millions of dollars. Another column may chronicle the meeting of the Parent-Teachers Association, at which it was decided to enlist the cooperation of the local taxpayers, and open another playground. At the same meeting, perhaps, a movement was begun to secure scholarships for promising high-school pupils, or to place those unable to enter college in an employment which will fit in with their special ability, and thus set them well along the road to success.

There is much that is wholly admirable about this national religion of ours. Its result is that the public schools are always well supported, and, often enough, supported generously. To secure an accurate estimate of the sums annually expended by States and municipalities is not easy, but the total is over two billion dollars. In every municipality of any size, the largest single item in the budget is for the schools. As a rule, the expenditures for education in a given city equal about one-third the total expenditures for all purposes. The present policy is to extend facilities for elementary and secondary education, and to improve these facilities by any adjunct that money can buy. More to the point, the school authorities realize the value of awakening the interest, and engaging the personal support, of as many citizens as possible.

In many cities, it is understood that either a member of the school board, or the superintendent, if he has some gift for public speaking, or, in any case, someone entitled to represent the schools, is to hold himself in readiness to appear at Rotary and Kiwanis luncheons, at meetings of our multitudinous civic and literary societies for women, at conventions, dinners, and similar gatherings, to tell what the local schools are doing, and what they wish to do. The school authorities expect no tremendous reaction from any one meeting or convention, but they know that a definite plan of always keeping the schools before the public builds up a favorable community opinion which will become not the least valuable of the schools' assets. "The schools are *your* schools" may be only a slogan, but when a community is continually hearing about these schools and their work, a sense of ownership is on the way. The "psychology" is simply this: it is easier to ask a man for money to improve his own property, than to ask him to improve something in which he is not particularly interested.

From all this stirring of interest, our own schools derive no direct benefit. In fact, the continually increasing appropriations for the public schools make the task of conducting our own schools more difficult than ever. New taxes bear a direct relation to the cost of living, thus lessening voluntary contributions to our schools. New improvements in the public schools necessitate new improvements in the parish schools. The public schools not only have the advantage over us as recipients of public funds, but also as recipients of public interest and public favor, aroused through the simple but effective campaigns of which I have spoken. And since this inequality of funds will probably continue to increase, we Catholics should cast about for means of centering the interest of our own people upon our own schools.

Now while the parish system has served us well in the past, many of us are convinced that in some respects it is unsatisfactory. Our schools often become "parochial" in the wrong sense. Being the exclusive possession, under the present system, of one group, the interest of the body of Catholics at large is not only not invited, but, occasionally, even resented. "It's my yard, and you can't play in it." As a correspondent once wrote in AMERICA, what is called "the parish system" is often not a system at all, but a collection of schools of varying standards, subject, indeed, to ecclesiastical authority, but responsible to no educational authority, and controlled by none.

What appeals to many in the arguments for centralized diocesan control of the elementary schools is the larger participation in school management and direction which it offers the laity. This participation, it is true, was sanctioned forty years ago by the Council of Baltimore. It has not grown, however, probably for the reason that when every school is considered a complete unit instead of an integral part of a whole, the place for it is very small. In the practical exclusion of the layman from our school boards, we find one reason for the indifference toward our schools on part of men and women whose active interest would be equivalent to an endowment. When the layman is allowed to conclude that he does his full duty by contributing on "Envelope Sunday," he is not likely to undertake works of supererogation. Let him understand that something more is required, and he will give more. Long ago we learned in our catechisms that the Mass is *meum et vestrum Sacrificium*, my Sacrifice and yours, when priest and people unite before the altar. So, too, should it be with the school. Priests and people must work together, and not the least effective method of inducing lay activity is to seat Catholic laymen on the administrative boards of our schools.

A change from the present system can be effected, of course, only after the most careful study, and the ultimate decision rests with our Bishops. If the centralized system has its disadvantages, it likewise has advantages which the present system has not been able to secure, and among them is the larger place in our educational councils which it assigns the layman. Nothing is better calculated to secure for our schools a support at present lacking and sorely needed.

With Scrip and Staff

CANDLEMAS reminds us that the year is now well upon its way. One long month is gone, and a day to boot from its successor. Windows show a bit more outline in the early morning. There is a glimmer on the glass panel of the front door as you return from the day's work. Woe to those, according to the old belief, who have not cleared away this day all the Christmas decorations; who have—by perverse hoarding—not consumed all the Christmas sweetmeats; who have not acknowledged all their Christmas cards, or paid—well, the list is long enough.

With Candlemas the Christ Child, too, is upon His

way in the world: for the ruin of those who deny Him; the resurrection of those who welcome Him. Bethlehem's intimacies are over. The Wise Men are home again in the land of Ur, little dreaming of the gold, silver, turquoise and capis-lazuli ornaments that are buried beneath their feet, to be unearthed two thousand years later for the marveling of a time-sated generation. The Child is in the Temple before the multitude, blessed by the faithful few, ignored by the proud.

AND Simeon announces that Christ brings four great gifts to mankind: Peace, Salvation, Light, and Glory. Modern publicity brings the work of our missionaries, both home and foreign, out of the obscurity of Bethlehem into contact with the larger world. Glancing over the mission panorama one can say of it that it brings to mankind the same four gifts.

The missionary brings peace. By the renunciation, in recent times, by Catholic missionaries, of the protection of their home governments, the last link is snapped that might bind the missions with any use of physical force. On the other hand, the missions, by their powerful agency for union, as well as the principles of Christian teaching, are the only safeguard for peace in those Eastern and colonial countries where the least suspected, but the most dangerous germs of future wars exist. In much troubled and much-divided India, the settlement, on December 2, of the ancient question of Portuguese governmental patronage, involving the relations of the Holy See, the British and Portuguese Governments, and the various white and native elements, was a safeguard of peace, as has been the detached attitude of the Church during the recent troubles in China.

Intelligent students of missionary work, even those not of our Faith, realize that the missionary, in bringing to his people the means of eternal salvation, is, at the same time, saving them from the sway of tyrannous passions of hate, jealousy, greed, etc., which, left unbridled, only help to tighten their chains. With the light of the Gospel comes also the light of secular learning. Though the "bush" never ceases to be a limitless field, the halls of the university and the technical school claim the missionary as well. Nor is the glory of heroic lives, whether spent in hidden labors, or starred by martyrdom, lost upon the world at large.

DIFFICULTIES of a special kind, relative to our Alaskan missions, are reported by Msgr. William Hughes, director of the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions, Washington, who wrote on May 24, 1928, to Father Piet, Provincial of the California Jesuit Province:

I am very sorry that the Government cannot and will not do anything more for our schools in Alaska. When the pay for teachers was stopped (I think it was in 1922 or 1923), Mr. Lusk and I went over to the Bureau of Education and tried to have the salaries and support continued. That Bureau answered that the law prohibited any support of (so-called) sectarian schools. They quoted the law contained in the Indian Bill of 1897. It reads: "And it is hereby declared to be the settled policy of the Government to hereafter make no appropriation whatever for education in any sectarian schools."

That law became effective as regards schools under the Indian Department in 1897. But because the Alaskan schools were not under the Indian Department but under the Bureau of Education (although both are in the Interior Department), the law was not applied to Alaska simply by an oversight of the Bureau of Education.

The Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions expected this ruling at any time and constantly warned the Alaskan missionaries to be prepared for the inevitable.

When the Bureau of Education announced its decision, Mr. Lusk and I urged that the Sisters should be continued in the Civil Service. The Bureau replied that there was a ruling of the Secretary of the Interior, Walter Fisher, January 27, 1912, providing as follows: In Government Schools all insignia of any denomination must be removed from public rooms, and members of any denomination wearing distinctive garb should leave such garb off while engaged in lay duties as Government employees. If any case exist where such an employe cannot conscientiously do this, he will be given a reasonable time, not to extend, however, beyond the opening of the next school year after the date of this order, to make arrangements for employment elsewhere than in the Federal Indian Schools.

In some cases the public-school teachers are Protestant preachers of the fanatical type, who lose no opportunity to malign the Catholic Church. Nevertheless, the work of the Catholic missions goes steadily on, despite cold, loneliness, and enormous distances.

A PROGRESSIVE work, linking up a variety of enterprises and contacts, has been undertaken by the University of Louvain, in Belgium. The medical foundation of Louvain University in the Congo, known by the initial letters: FOMULAC, has established a mission hospital on the plateau of Kisantu, in the Belgian Congo. It comprises a hospital for the natives, with a surgical and medical pavilion and research laboratories; a hospital for Europeans; a residence for the physicians; and a convent for the nursing Sisters. Beds are provided for a hundred native patients. The physicians are paid partly by the Belgian Government, partly by the Foundation.

At Budapest, in Hungary, Father Kock is director of an institution providing residence for some twenty students who attend the courses and clinics at the University. After a certain period of time, they become Oblates of the Order of St. Benedict. Their living expenses are paid for by a near-by health resort. One of the young men, Dr. Molnar, after taking a course in tropical medicine at the University of Brussels, in Belgium, was adopted by the Belgian society for assisting the medical missions, the so-called A.M.M., and sent, with his wife, to the Congo.

At Würzburg, in Germany, physicians and students live in community, follow the courses in the University, and engage themselves to remain attached to the missions for a certain number of years as physicians or as medical helpers. Their Superior is Msgr. Becker, a former missionary. The newly founded Institute of Mary Immaculate, in England, is a congregation of Religious women who have taken their doctorate in medicine, and are ready to undertake any work that requires a scientific or medical formation, in any part of the world.

THE PILGRIM.

Literature

Shakespeare "Dyed a Papist"

JAMES J. WALSH

ONE of the most interesting documents that we possess in reference to Shakespeare is a brief sketch of his life written in the late seventeenth century, the last words of which are "He dyed a Papist." They were written by an earnest and sincere minister of the Anglican Church, the Rev. Richard Davies, archdeacon of Saper-ton, who had shared with Bishop Burnett in the writing of the history of the Reformation and was one of the most ardent controversialists for his church in England. The expression must therefore be taken quite seriously and has very definite historical significance.

Apropos of the question as to whether the distinguished Dr. William Harvey, discoverer of the circulation of the blood, was a Catholic or not, I discussed in AMERICA the significance of a similar expression to this reported to have been used by Judge Christopher Milton, brother of the English poet, John Milton, embodying the declaration that his brother John died in the Church. This Miltonic expression is contained in a document printed by order of the English Parliament and emanates from a rather well-known Anglican clergyman of the end of the seventeenth century who was also an archdeacon of the English Church. There is much more than a suspicion that Dr. William Harvey may have been a Catholic, and the quotation with regard to Milton was introduced in connection with the demonstration of how many distinguished writers of the seventeenth century in England went back to the old Mother Church. It was this very fact that the preacher to the House of Commons was bewailing in his sermon before that body, when he adduced as supreme evidence the expression that he had heard attributed to Judge Milton with regard to his brother John dying in the Church.

With this in mind, it is extremely interesting to note the reaction on the part of latter-day English biographers of Shakespeare with regard to the startling expression quoted in the title of this paper. Probably few men in our time have known so much about Shakespeare as Sir Sidney Lee, for years the editor of the "National Dictionary of Biography," who was said to be more familiar with the writers of Shakespeare's time and just afterwards than anyone else in our day. For some reason that he has not made clear, he was quite sure that there could not be any special significance in Archdeacon Davies' expression, so he brushes it aside and declares that it is only "a bit of late eighteenth-century gossip." Unfortunately for any such declaration as this, Archdeacon Davies' expression forms part of a series of documents registered as a gift to Corpus Christi College, Oxford, as early as 1690. This is a hundred years away from "late eighteenth century." Archdeacon Davies might very well have known and probably did know people thoroughly familiar with the events of Shakespeare's life in Stratford after his retirement.

It is rather surprising, seeing the importance and au-

thenticity of the declaration, that the documents in question have not been submitted to careful examination by the English writers of Shakespeare's life in our generation. At last, however, they have been collated very carefully, though, curiously enough, it was an American who did it. Madame Clara Longworth de Chambrun, who is one of the Longworths of Cincinnati, presents the results of her study of them in her volume, "Shakespeare Actor-Poet." This volume appeared also in French and was awarded the Bordin Prize by the French Academy. She has also written a book on Shakespeare's sonnets, as well as a volume on Florio, the translator of Montaigne into English, a work which it is now known influenced Shakespeare deeply. This book has also been crowned by the French Academy. These French awards are the surest proofs of the scholarly quality of Madame de Chambrun's work and at the same time are definite testimony to her originality.

When she applied at Corpus Christi College library for permission to look at the original documents which contain Archdeacon Davies' famous sentence, she met with an unexpected obstacle. Women are not allowed to read books in the Corpus Christi library. It is easy to understand that an obstacle like this would not prove unsurmountable for an enterprising American. There was a way of getting round this heritage from the days when Oxford Colleges had a monastic character. The Bodleian Library at Oxford borrowed the documents from Corpus Christi and as women may read in the Bodleian, Madame de Chambrun was permitted not only to study the manuscripts but also to secure photographs of the pages concerning Shakespeare. She found that these documents had never been consulted since the days when Dr. Alexander Dyce first mentioned them in his first edition of 1854.

The manuscripts were gathered by William Fulman, an ardent student and collector of literary material, who spent more than half a century in the filing and annotation of valuable documents and correspondence concerning his contemporaries as well as the distinguished men who had lived in the earlier part of the seventeenth century. Among these there is a short biographical notice of Shakespeare at the end of which occurs the words, "He dyed a Papist." These are not in Fulman's handwriting but in that of his friend, Archdeacon Davies. When Fulman died, leaving behind him an immense collection of notes and documents, he asked his friend Davies, who had shared his studies with him for some years, to "digest and classify" the papers. He even commissioned him to make such additions as seemed necessary to complete certain unfinished memoirs and then to turn the whole collection over to Corpus Christi. It is known that the Archdeacon completed his work before 1690, for Anthony á Wood, the well-known Oxford historian, mentions that the papers were in Corpus Christi library at that time, thought he was not allowed to see them, apparently because someone in authority at Corpus Christi was a little jealous of the work that Wood was doing. They seemed to have remained untouched until Dyce called attention to the famous sentence and then were not

consulted again until they came into Madame de Chambrun's hands.

After the consultation of them, she became quite convinced that the expression "He dyed a Papist" must be taken in its literal significance. The words come from a man who had the opportunity to know many people who had been alive in Shakespeare's time. It is altogether unlikely that he would have written the words into the Fulman papers unless he felt that Fulman would agree with him and they had probably talked the matter over. So far from being a Romanizer, or in any way favorable toward Catholicism, he was, as Madame de Chambrun says, "a zealous minister of the Anglican Church and like Fulman, an inveterate foe to papacy." She adds that, "he was one of the best controversial writers and speakers in the Church of England in those days." It is easy to understand, then, that Madame de Chambrun is ready to insist that when Archdeacon Davies "sets down the statement that Shakespeare died a Papist, we may be certain it was because he believed the information true, not because he wished to believe it was so."

She sums up the impression produced on her with regard to the passage in these striking words which surely must be taken to represent the conclusion that anyone will be forced to accept who looks into the matter without prejudice: "Like Davies—remaining in the Episcopal Church in which I was baptized—I agree with him in thinking that it is better to take note of the documents still in our possession rather than to twist or suppress historical truth to fit in with the personal tenets of modern writers."

Madame de Chambrun quotes some interesting comments that illustrate this twisting or suppression of historical truth in the subject under discussion. The Rev. Alexander Dyce, for instance, after having consulted the Fulman documents and noted Archdeacon Davies' expression, brushes it aside and reassures himself and his readers "This is contradicted by the tenor of Shakespeare's writings and the history of his life." He suggests that "Shakespeare may have incidentally let fall expressions unfavorable to Puritanism which were misrepresented as papistical"! Another distinguished English Shakespeare scholar is quoted in a bit of very similar twisting and suppression of the obvious literal meaning as follows: "Halliwell-Philips expresses a hope which is based on no grounds whatever that 'the poet's last hours were soothed by some Puritan pastor of the Halls' (his son-in-law's family) acquaintance.'" Is it any wonder that Madame de Chambrun should add the commentary, "Thus is history made in the image of each historian"?

Madame de Chambrun is of the opinion that Shakespeare lived and died a Catholic. She thinks that that fact throws light on his marriage. This is usually presumed to have been irregular since the first official notice of the marriage preceded by but three months the birth of their first child. The paper which validates the union was issued in the diocese of Worcester. No mention is made of the pastor who performed the ceremony nor of the church where it might have taken place. In other

cases like this at that time, such omissions usually mean that the ceremony had already been performed by a Catholic priest, for the country folk clung to the idea, as Madame de Chambrun says, that "it was better to be married by a priest than a Presbyterian, and the Bishops often agreed with them. If William Shakespeare and Ann Hathaway had been married by a priest, this was precisely at a time when it was dangerous to say so. The Ardens, of Shakespeare's mother's family, had just been put to death for the crime of "housing a seminary priest." Father Hall, who had been under their protection, was put to death with them and it was he who probably performed Shakespeare's marriage ceremony.

Manifestly this expression of Archdeacon Davies, "He dyed a Papist," has some very interesting connotations in Shakespeare's life and the conditions of his time. Now that the original documents have been consulted once more, it seems likely that the words will have to be taken much more seriously than they have been up to the present time.

REVIEWS

The Life and Tragedy of Alexandra Feodorovna, Empress of Russia. By BARONESS SOPHIE BUXHOEVEDEN. New York: Longmans, Green and Company. \$7.50.

The Baroness Buxhoeveden is the daughter of a Russian diplomat long a faithful servant of the Czar in various important offices. She was a lady-in-waiting on the Empress from 1913 and thus had the advantage of first-hand knowledge of the intimate life of the court and of the complex character of Alexandra Feodorovna. She has not tried to make her book a formal biography "but the life of a very human woman forced by fate to be a heroine of tragedy." In this effort she had the good fortune to be able to add to her own experiences a personal reference to the most authentic sources. She wishes to vindicate the Empress and remove the false impressions engendered through less reliable narratives, or inimical agencies. The Empress, in her estimation, "has been cruelly maligned and grossly wronged," in the gossip broadcast through confidences of indiscreet friends. In the Czarina's defense are detailed her many lovable qualities of heart and devotion to her husband and children and to the country of her adoption. The picture of the frenzied panorama of the last days at Ekaterinburg takes on a new interest as the tragic incidents are depicted by one of the small retinue allowed to share the misfortunes of the imperial family, and one of the last friends to see them. The Baroness herself narrowly escaped their dreadful fate. Although she does not tell this story in her book, after being forcibly separated from the Empress a short time before the murder, she made her way with much suffering and privation, through Siberia to China where the English embassy, by direction of the Dowager Queen Alexandra, assisted her and sent her to New York. She arrived here commended to the kind offices of the late Dr. Maurice Francis Egan who had known her intimately in Copenhagen, where her father was the Russian minister during Dr. Egan's ten year's residence there as the representative of the United States. She was in New York for two weeks at one of the leading hotels and none of the usually enterprising papers found her, or the sensational story she could tell. Dr. Egan and other friends suggested that she should make a statement, but she preferred silence until she reached her relatives and friends in London. So she sailed away and has waited until now to tell of her court experiences, and of the period ending in the wholesale murder that blotted out the old order and the reign of the Russian Czars.

T. F. M.

Thomas Aquinas: His Personality and Thought. By MARTIN GRABMAN. New York: Longmans, Green and Company. \$2.50.

Dr. Grabman, who is professor at the University of Munich, has done a splendid piece of work in summing up, analyzing and explaining the heart of the great scholastic's theology and philosophy. His study of the "Angelic Doctor" has already reached a fifth German edition. English-speaking students, to whom the original may be a closed volume, will give a hearty welcome to the excellent translation made by the Rev. Virgil Michel, O.S.B., Ph.D., of this timely and popular study. As the sub-title indicates, the first part of the book is devoted to the life of St. Thomas. At the age of twenty he received the habit of St. Dominic and when only thirty-two he was professor of theology in Paris. Later he taught this same subject in his native Italy and spent much time at the Papal court of Urban IV. Offered the archbishopric of Naples by Clement IV, he declined in favor of his chosen work of teaching. In 1268 he was made professor of theology in the University of Paris. He died in 1274 and was canonized half a century later. The second part of Dr. Grabman's volume is devoted to an outline of the great theologian's thought, the remarkable synthesis of Aquinas' teaching on God, man, the world, ethical and social philosophy. His literary labors alone were prodigious. The mere titles of his works cover nearly nine pages in Dr. Grabman's book. The author, an outstanding Thomistic authority, pleads for the historico-genetic method of studying St. Thomas. Such a method tries to understand a great mind from its relations to its own time and environment, and, in such a subject as the present one, has the advantage of being "a complement to the method of dialectical commentary, a reliable guide to the more profound and universal understanding, and to a correct appraisal of his teachings." The book will be of special interest to those engaged in the study of theology and may be read with great profit by those who wish a greater knowledge of "the Angel of the Schools" and an introduction to his work. M. J. F.

The Elements of Crime. By BORIS BRASOL. New York: Oxford University Press. \$5.00.

The author of this painstaking work, who was formerly prosecuting attorney for the Supreme Court of St. Petersburg, keeps strictly to his subject: avoiding the fields of criminal investigation, prevention and punishment. Writing after a career of wide experience, Mr. Brasol is free from extremes either of severity or of illusions, and his instincts are thoroughly sound. He is in no haste to seize on too simple a factor in the causality of crime, but carefully works out all of its contributing elements. Psychological, pathological and social causes are given their due, in accordance with what the author has judged to be the most reliable findings of modern investigators. The onesidedness of Lombroso and kindred theorists is exposed. While urging the utmost consideration for the psycho-pathological factors, the author lays full weight on moral and religious causes, as contrasted with the decay of family life, irreligious education (which he severely censures), and the clamor for material gain. Without understanding this, says the author, there can be no "scientific interpretation of the problem of crime." "Casual things," he remarks, "having but a remote relation to the phenomenon of crime, are being prominently brought to the attention of the public, instead of emphasizing the truth and demonstrating the basic fact that the appalling growth of delinquency is, in a large measure, the result of the dismemberment of the family and the vanishing of religion from the field of social phenomena." Christianity, he insists, "must be recognized as a socioeconomic power arresting the growth of criminal propensities," and his point is urged with a considerable number of instances, quotation, and arguments. A chapter is given to education and the press. The matter of insanity pleas and expert alienist testimony is carefully gone into. Mr. Brasol points out the well-known defects of the McNaughten rules, and of our Anglo-Saxon practice. The procedure of various countries is interestingly summarized, and remedies suggested, the value of which offers interesting matter for discussion. Where Mr. Brasol touches

on the field of abstract ethics or that of psychology there are passing statements that may be criticized from the standpoint of Catholic philosophical doctrine, as, for instance, with regard to the relative nature of morality, the relationship of cognition and volition, etc. But for those who can make the necessary corrections in these more speculative matters, the positive, practical features of the book, its wealth of information, and its strongly reasoned support of the foundations of society, will make it a useful guide in a field left far too much to inexperienced or to unsound teachers. J. L. F.

Two Arguments for Catholicism. By ANTONIN EYMIEU, S.J. Translated from the French by JOHN L. STODDARD. New York: Benziger Brothers. \$2.50.

It is not new for theologians to draw an apologetic argument supporting the claims of Catholicism, from the twofold fact that its doctrinal system and historical development when tested are wholly consistent. In his presentation of these arguments, Père Eymieu goes a step further than most of those who have heretofore insisted upon them, and maintains that the coherence and stability of Catholic doctrine are not merely sources for a negative defence of orthodox Christianity, but that they should be viewed as positive "notes," that is to say, practical signs enabling one to distinguish the true religion from religions which are false. Briefly, the two arguments may be summarized by stating that unless Catholicism is Divine it cannot possibly avoid presenting in its doctrinal system innumerable and evident contradictions, and, in the course of its history, innumerable and evident variations in its doctrine. However, as a matter of fact, it does not present such contradictions or variations. The process of the author's argumentation reduces his major premise to what amounts to a principle, and in the light of this principle he studies the dogmatic and historical facts which nineteen centuries of Catholicism present, deducing therefrom a positive and not a merely negative conclusion. By contrast he shows the contradictions and variations, dogmatic and historical, in other religions which lay claim to a Divine character. Upon Protestants especially the little volume should make a strong impression, both because of the author's logical processes and his accurate presentation and statement of facts. The distinguished convert-translator in making the French Jesuit's volume available to English readers, especially those not of the Faith, has done a splendid service. W. I. L.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

For Drama Week.—The annual celebration of Drama Week will be the occasion of a large number of decidedly interesting celebrations. Those who have acquired the "little-theater habit" as well as students of dramatic theory and literature will find abundant material to satisfy their interests and meet their needs. "The Development of Dramatic Art" (Appleton. \$6.00), by Donald Clive Stuart, is the first book of this nature and scope to be published, and it is a masterwork in its field. The author has traced the development of the dramatist's art from its origin in ancient Greek rituals to its latest forms of expression and the new stagecraft. There are detailed sections on Greek tragedy and comedy, the medieval drama, the French and Italian drama of the Renaissance and later continental drama in Germany, France and Russia. The admirable organization of the book lends clarity and unity to the subject.

For a more detailed study of a single period, Willard Thorp has offered a dissertation on "The Triumph of Realism in Elizabethan Drama: 1558-1612" (Princeton Univ. Press. \$2.00). This study is intended to show the gradual emancipation of the drama from didacticism in theme and plot and the consequent triumph of realism. Otelia Cromwell is particularly interested in Thomas Heywood's contribution to one phase of Elizabethan drama, namely, the plays presenting in plot, characterization, or general atmosphere, Elizabethan England. "Thomas Heywood: A Study in the Elizabethan Drama of Everyday Life" (Yale Univ. Press. \$2.00) indicates the poet's aim, and how he realized it.

John Galsworthy as a dramatist commands as large and enthu-

siastic an audience as that which applauds him as a novelist. "Plays" (Scribner's. \$2.50) contains in one volume all the Galsworthy productions. There are twenty-five in all, nineteen long dramas and six one-act plays. "Harvard Miracle Plays" (French. \$3.00) are edited by Donald Fay Robinson and introduced by Prof. George P. Baker. The volume contains ten miracle plays with notes and directions for their production. The fourth series of "One Act Plays for Stage and Study" (French. \$3.15) should prove of great help in arranging programs for Drama Week celebrations. American, English and Irish dramatists have helped to make up this collection of twenty-two contemporary plays which have never before been published in book form. The second volume of "Short Plays from American History and Literature" (French. \$1.85), by Olive M. Price, brings the drama to the school room and offers an opportunity for young Thespians to present interesting points of American history from the arrival of Columbus to the tragic days of Lincoln.

Four very brief plays, which cover a long period in the life of St. John G. Ervine, make their modest appearance in the little volume entitled, "Four One-Act Plays." (Macmillan. \$1.50). "The Magnanimous Lover" is the first of his plays and was produced in October of 1912. "Progress" is a tragic pacifist play which appeared after the war. "Ole George Comes to Tea" is a dialect fragment, and "She was No Lady" is a delicate and sympathetic bit of comedy.

"Sump'n Like Wings and A Lantern to See By" (French. \$2.00) are two Oklahoma plays by Lynn Riggs. They are both booked for a New York production this season; the first by the American Laboratory Theater and the second by the Lenox Hill Players. "All On a Summer's Day and Six Other Short Plays" (French. \$1.50) by Florence Ryerson and Colin C. Clements, is a varied and delightful collection which will appeal to the producer of plays in little theaters, schools and colleges. "Crick Bottom Plays" (French. \$1.50) by E. P. Conkle, comprises the best of this new dramatists' one-act sketches. His interest in these five pictures of life in the Mid-West reverts to the tillers of the soil who drive teams of horses instead of tractors.

Ethical Discussions.—A subtitle of "The Theory of Morals" (American Branch: Oxford University Press. \$1.50) by E. F. Carrith, indicates its scope as an introduction to ethical philosophy. After analyzing the various motives urged in defense of the different schools and in order to maintain their positions, the author sums up his own conclusions by the very unsatisfactory admission that they are still in a process of flux. At the same time he confesses that "of ethical writers I think that Kant and Butler come nearest to the truth, though I have also learned much, among the moderns, from Lotze and Martineau." There is no evidence in the volume that the author has any special acquaintance with Scholastic ethicists. It is a sad admission for a master in Israel that "I have not satisfied myself that there is any quality common to all right acts which makes them right. I think that probably most right acts consist in bringing about the distribution of satisfactions which is due in the circumstances. . ."

To attempt to discuss the economic or political advantages of birth control whilst ignoring its ethical implications, essentially results in a lopsided presentation of the problem. It were as valid a mental process to suggest that murder or lying were justifiable because of economic advantages which might be consequent on them. Yet substantially this is what the contributors to "Some More Medical Views on Birth Control" (Dutton. \$2.50), of which Norman Haire is the editor, maintain. While it suffers from other notable defects even in its purely physical and economic aspects, the inconsistency of contraceptive practices with sound ethics is sufficient to defeat the validity of its conclusions. All of the contributors to the volume, who are Englishmen, either openly advocate, or are inclined to advocate, the Neo-Malthusian practice that has become so prevalent. Many of them, incidentally, make open profession of their rejection of religion and their subscription to hedonistic and materialistic philosophical systems.

The Case of Sergeant Grischa. Dear Senator. Four Ducks on a Pond. The Men of Silence. Victim and Victor.

The appearance of first novels and the announcement that a book is one of a trilogy, usually demands at least casual attention from those interested in books. "The Case of Sergeant Grischa" (Viking. \$2.50) by Arnold Zweig, possesses both these features. Beyond them it possesses all the strength its size suggests; it is a child with the mental rating of a man. Zweig weaves around the incident of the execution of a Russian prisoner all the aspects of militaristic Germany. Romance and intrigue, hunger and hope, humanity, brutality, are each in contact with the wires that carry messages concerning the disposition of Grischa. The two other volumes, yet to be written, are to deal with German education before the war, and the nation's industrial progress since 1918. It is to be hoped that they have the range and reality, the frank observation and the fresh originality of the first.

McCready Huston is a newspaper editor of South Bend, Ind. This is enough to stand witness for the fact that he has a discerning as well as a showman's eye. In "Dear Senator" (Bobbs-Merrill. \$2.50) he has been showman enough to depict the triumphant course of a not too brilliant mid-western lawyer to the United States Senate. He has been discerning enough to make his characters true to life, to make the actual progress to a questioned success the minor motif to an unusual love story, to make the whole a political novel that ranks with those of Winston Churchill and Brand Whitlock. What satire there is does not strike back to pain the reader; nor is there any mud on the mirror he holds up to the contemporary age.

The charming story of a girl's fight against the fear that was her very birthright is the basic material for Ruth Sawyer's "Four Ducks on a Pond" (Harper's. \$2.00). Tad Mason leaves the mud of her father's farm for the State college, and later aids a brother and a sister to escape its dread environment. How she met Danny Herron from Antrim, and "Old Paraquet," among other pleasant people, and how she overcame the fear which shook her life, replacing it by love, is the remainder of the story. Ruth Sawyer has presented a recipe for a happy marriage.

The code of *amerta*, or "honorable silence," has as much vogue today in New York and other American cities as it enjoyed in the Naples of two decades ago, described by Louis Forgione in "The Men of Silence" (Dutton. \$2.50). This is a tale of one of the classic crimes of the *camorra*. It reminds one of the stoical refusal until death to break the code of Arnold Rothstein; it recalls the Jerge and Yale murders; it brings back the role of "Scarface" Capone and sets one wondering about the strange inability of the police to check the current of lawlessness. This story about the old Cuocolo murder, which led eventually to the downfall of "the most fantastic and powerful criminal organization in the history of the world" should make interesting reading for those Americans who are thrilled by "racketeering." However, the story may prove rather tame, in view of the high-powered, machine-gun methods of the present day.

John Rathbone Oliver has worked out a very strange theme in "Victim and Victor" (Macmillan. \$2.50). A doctor and an Anglican minister combine forces for the treatment of psychasthenic patients. But this only supplies background and properties for the stage. The crux of the book is the struggle of Michael Mann, a deposed minister, for reinstatement. Catholics will find the book very confusing, because there are so many things borrowed from Catholic ritual that it is rather difficult to distinguish when an Anglican rite is being observed. A strong friendship grows between the physician and the minister. Dr. Claude Monroe, who tells the story is in constant wonder over his privilege to enjoy such a friendship. The method conveys the impression of reality and leaves the reader wondering whether this is a record of actual happenings or entirely fiction. The reason for Mann's deposition is not given; consequently it is rather unfair to throw out the impression that he is made to suffer more on account of irritated authority than for his actual wrongdoing. However, the two main characters have been so skilfully presented that one is deeply moved with sympathy for them.

Communications

Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.

"Liberal Louisville"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

May I call your attention to the following in the *Record*:

We regret to read in the December 29 issue of AMERICA an article by one of the associate editors entitled "Liberal Louisville." The article is uncalled for, unjust, in a word, unfortunate. We trust that it misrepresents AMERICA no less than Louisville. It cannot be the policy of any worthy publication to hold up to scorn and ridicule the people of a whole community because of things not to his taste a fault-finder reads in some pamphlet or newspaper, and it cannot create good will toward Catholics or respect for Catholic opinion and institutions in any community for a Catholic publication to picture the people of their city as wanting in social justice, chivalry, courtesy and appreciation of the finer things of life. We do not believe any city in our land deserves to be pictured in such fashion and we know Louisville does not. "Liberal Louisville" is one article of which the author ought to be ashamed.

Possibly you will have some comment to offer in return on this subject.

Louisville.

J. C.

[J. C. is referred to the article, "A Letter from Louisville," on page 408 of this issue.—Ed. AMERICA.]

Confession in Hospital Wards

To the Editor of AMERICA:

After a wide experience of over twenty years, attending Catholic patients in hospitals, may I be allowed a few observations?

In practically all Sisters' hospitals I have found every convenience and accommodation for the medical doctors and surgeons. There is a special parlor for their use, a wash room, a dressing room, an examining room, an X-ray room, an anesthesia room, an operating room, an emergency operating room, chart room, etc.

When the doctor comes for an operation, everything is in readiness. The patient has been carefully looked after. The operating room is prepared. It is warm; it has plenty of light; it is in a quiet part of the hospital, free from distracting noises. Everything is ready. The doctor can carry on his work under the most favorable conditions. Nothing is allowed to interfere.

On the other hand, as a Catholic priest, I am called to the same hospital to perform a much more delicate operation—to cut out the multifarious cancer of sin that has been growing deep down into the soul for five, twenty, maybe fifty years. The medical doctor has an easy task compared to mine. He has to do with the inert body that cannot escape his knife. I have to do with the elusive soul that as often as not seeks to remain in its sleep of sin and death. If conditions are made as favorable as possible for the medico, much more do I need favorable conditions to carry out a most delicate spiritual operation.

But—I am called. I find my patient, as a rule, in a closely packed ward. There is a thin screen around his bed. Inside that screen is my examining room, X-ray room, dressing room, operating room, etc., etc., all combined! Some of the other patients are near at hand—within a few feet. . . .

Some patients in making their confession can whisper low enough not to be heard by anyone save the confessor. In my experience they are the exception. The ordinary patient whose senses are dulled and wasted by illness or by an accident, has a rather loud voice which no amount of caution can make lower.

Now the law of the Catholic Church concerning the secrecy of confession is very strict. No penitent is under obligation to confess if the proper secrecy is not secured. I speak to the Sister in charge. She believes the patients near at hand cannot hear. I investigate and find that they have the faculty of hearing all right and are very near—too near to risk a confession under the cir-

cumstances. . . . Or I may even be told that the patient has nothing of any consequence to tell anyway!

I try to get the patient moved to where he can confess in peace and security. As a rule I am told it is impossible. As the only way out of the difficulty, I ask the patient to be sorry for all his sins and, if he ever gets a chance to make an integral confession with the necessary secrecy, to do so at the first opportunity. Then I absolve him, give him the other Sacraments, and so send him on the way to eternity. . . .

Of course city and State hospitals do not make any provisions for patients to confess their sins in absolute secrecy. Unfortunately, neither do the Sister's hospitals that copy them. . . .

Why cannot there be on every floor of a Sisters' hospital a small room where a patient—bed and all—may be slipped in? There in security and peace he could have an opportunity of making a full confession and of freely discussing with his confessor the supreme matter of his soul. There also he could receive such advice and consolation as may be necessary and proper, all without danger of being overheard or disturbed by other patients or by attendants. To my mind it would be by far the most precious and most necessary room in the hospital.

M. R. P.

"Wandering Youth in Germany"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

"Wandering Youth in Germany," by the Rev. Kilian J. Hennrich, in the issue of AMERICA for January 12, calls for a word, as the author seems to complain that the topic has "received scant notice outside of Central Europe."

Two year's post-war experience in Germany has convinced me that Father Hennrich has painted for us only the silver lining; underneath lies the dark cloud. Shortly after the War, the youth of Germany took to hiking; whether spontaneously or by inspiration I know not, but I incline to the former. Time and again I have heard German parents complain of the lack of control over the youthful members of the family, due to the sudden crash of the former military discipline. But it is a fact; the youth of Germany are hiking, boys and girls together; the boys scantily clad in breeches that miss the knees and leave the thigh half bare, and the girls aping the boys in their scanty dress. It is not unusual to see them strumming their mandolins and guitars in the railroad stations as late as ten o'clock at night. Nor are they averse to accepting money. I have met the groups or parties, pictured by Father Hennrich as wandering under the supervision of carefully picked guides. But I have also met them in groups of six or eight seventeen-year-old carefree boys and girls, out for a three days' or three weeks' lark. Oftentimes the fields form their bed, and in summer the lakes and creeks their common swimming hole.

Clerical friends, natives of Germany, have violently condemned the vicious practice. If Father Hennrich insists that all this goes on by inspiration, I can only add that it must be part of the cultus of the flesh now prevalent in Germany, the same cultus that gives us news reels of German feminine athletes in athletic trunks, parading down the boulevards, en masse, to the arenas.

In place of religious training, seemingly the only other efficient restraint for youth is human respect. In our own country, youths in twos and fours jump into an auto, step on the gas, and in a few moments are miles away from home and friends. There in the midst of strangers they may indulge their caprices. German youths, lacking autos, get the same results by hiking. It is something more than boys and girls together tripping the light fantastic on the neighborhood sidewalks.

If Father Hennrich intended to praise the "Society for Providing Shelters for Youth" I commend him; it is an institution growing out of a recognized evil. But apparently he did not carry out his intention. A good part of the article seems to be given over to the praise of the *Wandervögel* themselves and their methods. Personal experience forbids that I agree with him. And was not the *Neu Deutschland*—a Catholic organization of youth—instituted precisely to combat the *Wandervögel*?

Phoenix, Ariz.

JOS. A. VAUGHAN, S.J.